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<td>ABRL</td>
<td>Anchor Bible Reference Library</td>
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<tr>
<td>AcBib</td>
<td>Academia Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCS</td>
<td>Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Applications of Cognitive Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcT</td>
<td>Acta Theologica</td>
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<td>AGJU</td>
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<td>Biblical Languages: Greek</td>
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<td>BNTC</td>
<td>Black’s New Testament Commentary</td>
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<tr>
<td>Brain Lang</td>
<td><em>Brain and language</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td><em>Brain and Cognition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRR</td>
<td>Brain Research Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>The Biblical Resource Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSac</td>
<td><em>Bibliotheca sacra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZAW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZNW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
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<td>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
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<td>CC</td>
<td><em>Cerebral Cortex</em></td>
</tr>
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<td>CGTC</td>
<td>Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td><em>Cognitive Linguistics</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR</td>
<td>Cognitive Linguistics Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Antiquity</td>
<td><em>Classical Antiquity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class World</td>
<td><em>Classical World</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Philol</td>
<td>Classical Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogn Neurodyn</td>
<td>Cognitive Neurodynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConBNT</td>
<td>Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCT</td>
<td>Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL</td>
<td>Cambridge Studies in Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTLC</td>
<td>Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDbDP</td>
<td>Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Dead Sea Discoveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRS</td>
<td>Eerdmans Biblical Resource Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>The Expression of Cognitive Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECL</td>
<td>Early Christianity and Its Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJL</td>
<td>Early Judaism and Its Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEC</td>
<td>Emory Studies in Early Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESW</td>
<td>Ecumenical Studies in Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvRT</td>
<td>Evangelical Review of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp Tim</td>
<td>Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFNT</td>
<td>Foundations and Facets: New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRLANT</td>
<td>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNS</td>
<td>Good News Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTJ</td>
<td>Grace Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HdO</td>
<td>Handbuch der Orientalistik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermeneia</td>
<td>Hermeneia. A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGV</td>
<td>Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsSt</td>
<td>Israel Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAAR</td>
<td>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Journal of Cognitive Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Journal of Consciousness Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEP: General</td>
<td>The Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESP</td>
<td>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JETS</td>
<td>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFSR</td>
<td>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Hell Stud</td>
<td>The Journal of Hellenic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIS</td>
<td>Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL-SMi</td>
<td>Janua Linguarum Series Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoCN</td>
<td>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoT</td>
<td>Journal of Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoR</td>
<td>The Journal of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPC</td>
<td>Journal of Psychology and Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Pragmat</td>
<td>Journal of Pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSJ</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSJS</td>
<td>Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNTSup</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOTSup</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>Journal Storage. jstor.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairos</td>
<td>Kairos Journal of Philosophy and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTAH</td>
<td>Key Themes in Ancient History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAI</td>
<td>Library of Ancient Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEC</td>
<td>Library of Early Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHB</td>
<td>Library of Hebrew Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHBOTS</td>
<td>Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>Longman Linguistics Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNTS</td>
<td>The Library of New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Midland Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNTC</td>
<td>Moffatt New Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSJ</td>
<td>The Master’s Seminary Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>New American Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGTC</td>
<td>The New International Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICNT</td>
<td>New International Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOT</td>
<td>New International Commentary on the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td><em>Neural Networks</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNMC</td>
<td>Neural Network Modeling and Connectionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td><em>Novum Testamentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovTSup</td>
<td>Supplements to Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSBT</td>
<td>New Studies in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>New Testament Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTOA</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td><em>New Testament Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTS</td>
<td>New Testament Tools and Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBT</td>
<td>Overtures to Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Oxford Handbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHO</td>
<td>Oxford Handbooks Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR</td>
<td>Old Testament Readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OtSt</td>
<td><em>Oudtestamentische Studiën</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBM</td>
<td>Paternoster Biblical Monographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;BNS</td>
<td>Pragmatics and Beyond New Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBMB</td>
<td><em>Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Paul in Critical Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhilPsych</td>
<td><em>Philosophical Psychology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof</td>
<td><em>Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSt</td>
<td>Perspectives in Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Pauline Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB&amp;R</td>
<td><em>Psychonomic Bulletin &amp; Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychRev</td>
<td><em>Psychological Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QJEP</td>
<td><em>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Religions And Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevExp</td>
<td><em>Review and Expositor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRAS</td>
<td>Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RThN</td>
<td>Religion, Theology, and Natural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASLJS</td>
<td>Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Studies in Antiquity and Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBG</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLDS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLMS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLSBS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLSP</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLStBL</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLTT</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBTJ</td>
<td>Southern Baptist Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScEs</td>
<td>Science et Esprit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Sather Classical Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Studies and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSSRL</td>
<td>Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semeia</td>
<td>Semeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SemeiaSt</td>
<td>Semeia Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Scripture and Hermeneutics Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNT</td>
<td>Supplements to Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTMS</td>
<td>Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAN</td>
<td>Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJ</td>
<td>Stone-Campbell Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Sacra Pagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>Studies in Philosophical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBibLit</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDJ</td>
<td>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STJ</td>
<td>Scottish Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVTP</td>
<td>Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Syria: Archéologie, art et histoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS</td>
<td>Topics in Cognitive Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLJS</td>
<td>Taubman Lectures in Jewish studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLR</td>
<td>The Linguistic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiCS</td>
<td>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNTC</td>
<td>The New Testament in Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAJ</td>
<td>Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TynBul</td>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USFISFCJ  University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism
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Abstract

In a wide-ranging analysis, Karl-Heinrich Ostmeyer concludes that the various New Testament authors express the same purpose for prayer: successfully binding people to God in Christ. For Ostmeyer, Paul’s prayer language manifests this single-mindedness as the intent to integrate everyone into a prayer-relationship to God. Given the coherence-contingency conundrum of Pauline theology, these are bold assertions. This thesis examines to what extent Ostmeyer’s conclusions may be valid and valuable for understanding how prayer functioned in Paul’s Gentile mission. The enquiry can be summarised in three questions. To what extent did prayer define the mission? To what extent was Paul’s own act of prayer necessary to execute the mission, and why? To what extent did the prayers of his audiences constitute their participation in that mission?

To address these questions, this thesis appropriates aspects of Embodied Cognitive Science, which maintains that human cognition is not a localised process within the brain, but phenomenally emerges from embodied human interaction with others and the environment. Thought, language, and behaviour are grounded in, and partially constituted by, sensorimotor perception (i.e. that which is seen, heard, touched, tasted, and smelt). Paradoxically, these activities are generally perceived as coherent even though they are perpetually contingent processes of dynamic integration. Consciousness, commonly called the human mind, is simultaneously the process and product of integrating the individual’s perception of needs, desires, and volition with the continual sensorimotor experience characteristic of human life.

This thesis argues that Paul’s prayer language was necessarily grounded in his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus. Understanding the function of prayer language in his Gentile mission begins by asking how it related to what he perceived, and concludes by asking how his prayer language provided the sensorimotor perception necessary for his audience to understand what he was trying to tell them. The conclusion is that the formative aspect of prayer in Paul’s Gentile mission was a reciprocal property: organising time and space to conceptualise divine-human communication, and being reorganized in time and space by the resurrection of Jesus to actualise divine-human interaction. The contribution to Pauline scholarship is illustrating that engagement between biblical studies and neuroscience is both necessary and beneficial due to the common quest to understand being human.
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Preface

Raffiniert ist der Herrgott aber boshaft ist er nicht.
— Albert Einstein

Nothing about this thesis is ‘academic’ in the way that term is popularly misused. It is personal. I have always loved the church. Some of my earliest and fondest memories are connected to the church where I was baptised as an infant, Mt. Bethel UMC in the Bethlehem Community of Alexander County, North Carolina. In September of 1974, I received a RSV Bible, inscribed with my name, from the UMC in Garner, North Carolina. The following year, tragedy would begin to beset my family and I would spend the next decade in nearly utter isolation, under tremendous stress and abuse, and sometimes in danger. Church attendance was sporadic, mainly on the first Sunday of the month because that was Communion Sunday in the Lutheran church where we were members during those years.

At the age of 21, I was married and a father. At 24, the marriage was in jeopardy. One day I began to read the bible I had been given seventeen years earlier. To this day, I have no explanation as to how, or why, I kept up with that bible. I still have it. What I do know, is that the more I read, the more I had hope. (We just celebrated our 28th wedding anniversary, which is even more amazing because she came down with ovarian cancer one month before I began this thesis.)

The more I read, the more I wanted to read. This led to an eighteen-year stint in pastoral ministry, during which I was faced with the pain of faithful, and not so faithful, believers as they asked me why God had not answered their prayers. I always suspected that the answer involved our misunderstanding and misuse of prayer, but had nothing substantial to offer. I began this study to change that—seven years ago.

Essentially, this thesis is an exercise in practical theodicy. It represents my struggle to overcome significant personal neurological trauma and help the institution which has been my life line since the umbilical cord was cut. It is muddled in places, but it is filled with hope, much more than I anticipated. I am no longer in the pastorate and I have no expectation that this study will impact the church. I do hope to pursue further research concerning the connection between neurobiology and prayer. Regardless of how it may be assessed, this thesis is offered out of sincere curiosity into the nature of humanity created in the image of God and the nature of the God who became incarnated so that we might have life, and have it to the fullest. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, Amen.

The Second Sunday of Easter

23 April 2017
Krister Stendahl’s 1980 article “Paul at Prayer” is the perfect example of the importance and difficulty of studying Paul’s prayer language.¹ Although several points in the article are disputed in this thesis, most of the differences appear to arise, in part, from divergent approaches to the same goal—asking the question, “In what sense is Paul’s prayer normative for the church.”² This question is both the most difficult and the single most important reason for continuing to study the function of prayer in Paul’s Gentile mission. As Stendahl says, analysing Paul’s greetings, doxologies, and confessional language sheds light on the “full spectrum” of his language because Paul’s writing “is saturated by prayerful language,” and, “It is as apostle that Paul speaks a language which constantly borders on prayer and doxological confession.”³ Despite the sympathetic reading given to his article, this thesis offers a nuanced challenge to his conclusion that modern Christians are so far removed from Paul and his mission that, “it would be stifling and wrong to say that Paul taught us what it is proper for a Christian to pray about.”⁴ While this thesis supports Stendahl’s position that Paul’s letters cannot be directly transposed into modern life, the conclusions in this study challenge his opinion that, “It could perhaps even be argued that Paul was ‘too caught up in his work’ and his prayers were also. They are the prayers of an apostle, a missionary with eschatological urgency.”⁵

This thesis agrees that eschatological urgency characterised Paul’s prayers, and enquires to what extent it may be extrapolated to describe the function and efficacy of prayer in his Gentile mission. This involves three questions: 1) To what extent did prayer define and distinguish Paul’s mission; 2) To what extent was Paul’s own act of prayer necessary to the execution of the mission, and why; 3) To what extent did the prayers of his audiences constitute their participation in that mission, and why? The answers presented here challenge Stendahl because they are further extrapolated to propose that Paul’s eschatological urgency is exactly what remains normative for Christian prayer.

⁴ Stendahl, “Paul at Prayer,” 248–249. Stendahl wrote as a pastor who felt the need to correct what he believed to be misunderstandings and misuses of prayer.
⁵ Stendahl, “Paul at Prayer,” 249.
Analysing Paul’s prayer language with sufficient scientific and academic rigour faces two immediate challenges. First, Paul’s letters present various, and potentially contradictory, impressions of prayer. Even if his prayer language presents a measure of coherence, can it be articulated without ignoring the contingencies or using a reductionist hermeneutic? Second, prayer is an enigmatic concept which is commonly considered to occur, or at least originate, inside the mind. This produces serious doubt that the function and efficacy of such a subjective experience can be measured.

In response to these challenges, this thesis employs insights from the relatively new field of Embodied Cognitive Science (ECS) to build upon Karl-Heinrich Ostmeyer’s comprehensive study of New Testament prayer language. However, this approach creates additional challenges because it involves cognitive and linguistic theories which simultaneously provide affirmation and present fundamental challenges to Pauline scholarship that extend beyond the strict interpretation of prayer language. To present this thesis as straightforwardly as possible, this introduction is limited to an initial description of the theses set forth and a summary outline of the study.

1.1) The Theses

The four theses put forward are: 1) Paul’s prayer language was necessarily grounded in his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus, which, 2) constituted a restructured
ontology of human existence comprised of eternal physical life; 3) Although Paul understood that the human experience was still structured by sin and death, he was convinced that the alternative, life-structured ontology wrought by the resurrection of Jesus was presently accessible, and would eventually emerge as the general human sensorimotor experience; 4) Paul’s prayer language necessarily emerged from his own participation in the emerging life-structured ontology, and provided the sensorimotor perception necessary for his audiences to understand what he was trying to tell them.9

1.2) Thesis Outline

This thesis is comprised of three parts. Part I presents the methodological approach by showing that interpreting Paul’s prayer language inherently involves the science of the mind and that ECS is necessary because: 1) It describes an objective prototypical human cognition without violating the historic separation between the text and the exegete; 2) It shows that there is a difference between the human perception of cognition and language, and their actual function; 3) It grounds the affirmations and challenges to past research within a scientific and philosophic paradigm that encourages further discussion. Chapter two reviews six important monographs on Pauline prayer, explains why Ostmeyer’s work is a significant development, and describes why his work is the point of beginning for this thesis. Chapter three proposes a hermeneutic of embodied cognition derived from ECS, and describes how it is applied to Paul’s prayer language.10

Part II addresses why it is critical to understand that Paul’s prayer language was not a unique religious expression in the first-century Mediterranean context, and yet was distinct from both 2T Jewish prayer and Graeco-Roman sociocultural religious expression. Chapter four shows how ECS qualifies the application of ancient epistolary and rhetorical categories to both Graeco-Roman and Pauline prayer language. Chapter five argues that

---

9 See 3.4 for the technical description.

Paul’s prayer language represents a hermeneutic of obedience and differentiation which characterised the use of prayer language in the 2TP, and contributed to the survival of Christianity as an independent religious system.

Part III applies the proposed embodied hermeneutic to Paul’s prayer language in order to answer the thesis questions listed above in light of Ostmeyer’s conclusions. Chapter six examines the function of Paul’s prayer reports. Chapter seven analyses the emotive certainty associated with his wish-prayers. Chapter eight examines the function of his blessings and doxologies. Chapter nine examines Paul’s curses as characteristic of the first-century worldview, and yet distinct due to their missional function. Chapter ten analyses some difficulties associated with Paul’s practical instructions on prayer. Chapter eleven presents the conclusions and proposes other avenues of enquiry which may advance the perspective of this study.

In the words of Thomas Nagel:

> The hope is not to discover a foundation that makes our knowledge unassailably secure but to find a way of understanding ourselves that is not radically self-undermining, and that does not require us to deny the obvious. The aim would be to offer a plausible picture of how we fit into the world.11

Analogously, the aim of this study is to offer a plausible picture of how Paul’s prayer language fit into his world as an embodied function of his Gentile mission without undermining his theological claims or denying any exegetical difficulties.

---


Formally called Theory of Mind (ToM), the science of the mind attempts to explain how people identify and comprehend their own cognitive abilities and those of others.1 Categorically, there have been three paradigm shifts in ToM science: Cartesian, Cognitive, and Embodied.2 A Cartesian ToM views the human mind and brain as cooperative, but separate, entities.3 A Cognitive ToM approaches the human person as an information processing organism with causal links between the mind and the ‘neural circuitry’ of specialised areas in the brain.4 An Embodied ToM is an amalgam of neural, bodily, and environmental structures and processes which are variously available to conscious awareness.5 Therefore, cognition is potentially distributed across a wide spectrum of possible volitional interactions which are simultaneously caused by sensorimotor perception and the result of sensorimotor capacity.6

Part I illustrates that reductionist and mechanistic theories of cognition and language persist in the interpretation of Paul’s prayer language because, “The view of linguistic communication as achieved by encoding thoughts in sound is so entrenched in Western culture that it has become hard to see it as a hypothesis rather than a fact.”7 George Lakoff says:

In this traditional view, our minds are abstract, logical, unemotionally rational, consciously accessible, and above all, directly able to fit and represent the world. Language has a special place in this view of what a human is—it is a privileged,

---


2 Although oversimplified, the distinctions are generally accepted, and important for orienting this project.

3 “Cartesian dualism,” “the hermeneutic of doubt,” or the dictum Cogito, ergo sum do not adequately describe the Cartesian ToM. Although it excludes phenomena as an epistemological category, this “error” produced dramatic advances in knowledge by encouraging scientists to question fundamental assumptions of reality until they discovered that which could not be reduced.


5 See Rowlands, Embodied Phenomenology, 83. Cf. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 11, “It is the rule of thumb among cognitive scientists that unconscious thought is 95 percent of all thought.”


logical symbol system internal to our minds that transparently expresses abstract concepts that are defined in terms of the external world itself.\textsuperscript{8}

Alternatively, ECS studies perception, thought, language, and behaviour as interdependent aspects of a single integrated cognitive process endemic to the human person as an embodied being integrated in a physical environment. According to Alva Noë,

Languages are not abstract symbol systems, or at least this is not all they are. Languages are aspects of engaged human living … Insofar as language is itself socially manufactured and shared by a linguistic community, then to that extent our cognitive powers require for their very exercise the existence of a sociolinguistic environment.\textsuperscript{9}

Therefore, Part I claims that ECS balances the interpretive scale of \textit{Formgeschichte} and the \textit{religionsgeschichtliche Schule} because the weaknesses in each approach result from some type of disembodied view of cognition and language. The challenge is that ECS is a classic example of Thomas Kuhn’s description of a \textit{theory-induced} scientific revolution.\textsuperscript{10}

Between the late 1960’s and early 1990’s, multiple disciplines (including linguistics, philosophy, psychology, and biology) independently perceived that the scientific positivism inherited from Copernicus and Galileo could not explain human thought and behaviour as functions of cause and effect.\textsuperscript{11} Even today, Kuhn’s description of how a theory-induced revolution begins is applicable to the current state of ECS—there is no single paradigm for research. “Instead, a number of theories, all derived from relatively accessible phenomena [are] in competition.”\textsuperscript{12}

Yet, there is fundamental agreement in the field that human thought, language, and behaviour are grounded in, and partly constituted by, sensorimotor interaction with others and the environment. In other words, the human mind, “emerges at the productive

\textsuperscript{8} George Lakoff, foreword to Bergen, \textit{Louder Than Words}, ix.


\textsuperscript{12} Kuhn, \textit{Revolutions}, 61. See Chemero, \textit{Radical ECS}, 13–15, for his description of ECS in terms of Kuhn’s paradigm.
interface of brain, body, and social and material world.” Again, Thomas Nagel is on point:

> If contemporary research in molecular biology leaves open the possibility of legitimate doubts about a fully mechanistic account of the origin of life, dependent only upon the laws of chemistry and physics, this can combine with the failure of psychophysical reductionism to suggest that principles of a different kind are also at work in the history of nature, principles of the growth of order which are in their logical form teleological rather than mechanistic.14

The difficulty is adjudicating the confluence of biology, the environment, and volition without resorting to either philosophic or mechanistic reductionism. The next two chapters illustrate that the best opportunity for success is an Embodied ToM that approaches human cognition and language using Stuart Kauffman’s concept of a “non-algorithmic, non-determinate yet non-random” system.15 In general, this means that formal morpho-syntactic considerations are not prescriptive evidence for hermeneutical objectivity, but descriptive procedural markers for the emergence of inferential meaning.

---


14 Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*, 7. Italics mine. Cf. neuroscientist Jonah Lehrer, “Science needs art to frame the mystery, but art needs science so that not everything is a mystery. Neither truth alone is our solution, for our reality exists in plural.” Proust Was a Neuroscientist (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2007), x.

Chapter 2) From Formgeschichte to an Embodied Hermeneutic

Although methodological discussions must begin with presuppositions, this literature review does not use other scientific understandings and hermeneutic approaches as foils.¹ Instead, it illustrates that the value of ECS for analysing Paul’s prayer language emerges at points of agreement as well as divergence. The working assumptions are that agreements represent evidence for ECS, and divergences either predate ECS or indicate where ECS has not made the academic transition to biblical studies.²

The six monographs reviewed are grouped by methodology, in somewhat of an inverse relationship to this study. However, there are three common parameters which align this study with previous research. First, analysing Paul’s prayer language is significant for understanding his apostolic mission because it connotes a relationship between his mission and his belief that Israel’s anticipated Messiah was embodied in the resurrected Jesus of Nazareth. Second, Paul’s use of prayer language was characteristic of 2T Judaism in the first-century Mediterranean context, and was related to the immediate concerns of each letter. Third, despite differing opinions on the degree to which his language was ‘Hellenized,’ Paul’s prayer language represents his personal style.

The first section reviews Paul Schubert, Gordon Wiles, and Peter O’Brien as different degrees of structuralism. The second section reviews Günther Harder and Adalbert Hamman as slightly different theological anthropologies. The concluding section explains the significance of Ostmeyer’s work and describes how ECS advances his contribution.

2.1) Paul Schubert, Gordon Wiles, and Peter O’Brien

Despite Paul Schubert’s commitment to Formgeschichte, he analysed Paul’s epistolary thanksgivings to support Adolph Deissmann’s claim, “Der Apostel Paulus ist Briefschreiber, nicht Epistolograph. Er ist noch kein Mann der Literatur,” and receives credit for the conclusion that Paul was no slavish imitator of Graeco-Roman epistology.³ He intended to show that Paul’s thanksgivings were integral to the

---

¹ See Chemero, Radical ECS, 3–16, for why addressing presuppositions is necessary, although generally unconvincing and risks intimating that everyone else is wrong.

² The circular reasoning is readily admitted.

entirety of each respective letter, since, “It is already clear from their length and consistent position that they are not mere ornaments.”⁴ He concluded: “The writing of epistolary thanksgivings is with Paul a matter of firm and meaningful habit … that … can be adequately understood only as products of vital attitudes and social situations.”⁵

Since communication is partly dependent upon a certain level of syntactic order, one cannot summarily dismiss his fundamental assumption that “Syntactical structure is unquestionably one of the most elementary and objective criteria of stylistic form, the choice of specific words and phrases being a second dependable criterion.”⁶ Likewise, his distinction between large unit cola and small unit cola is neither unreasonable nor completely removed from ECS.⁷ However, ECS rejects the idea that syntactic patterns constitute discrete cola, and that their objective value is proportional to their size or complexity. Therefore, the structure of Paul’s epistolary thanksgivings is not proportional to the relationship between Paul and his audiences.⁸ Furthermore, defining Paul’s thanksgivings as expanded variations of the Philemon thanksgiving undermines Schubert’s dismissal of small unit cola, and involves the very psychological guess-work he rejects.⁹

Yet, there is a measure of agreement with his claim that “modern science … helps to appreciate and interpret more correctly the continuity of literary and historical development as well as its changes and their causes; exegesis is no longer a matter of psychological subjectivism, but of social objectivism.”¹⁰ ECS views the continuity and

---

⁴ Schubert, Form, 11.
⁵ Schubert, Form, 183.
⁶ Schubert, Form, 10.
⁷ Schubert, Form, 11. He uses the term cola to describe identifiable syntactic units that represent thought-units. Shubert defines a large colon as “a syntactical whole … a verb and a subject—expressed or understood,” and small cola as “adverbial phrases … or plain adverbs and objects doubled or multiplied.” In his opinion, large unit cola offer objective evidence of style and function by showing a genetic relationship between different documents; however, small unit cola are “often the result of momentary caprice or fleeting inspiration or misplaced playfulness.”
⁸ Contra Schubert, Form, 183–184. “The structurally more elaborate thanksgivings (type Ia—Phlm, I Thess, Col, and Phil) characterize the more elaborate, intimate, and personal letters of Paul; the simpler thanksgivings (I Cor, Rom, and II Thess) characterize the structurally less elaborate and less intimate, less personal letters; still the less intimate εὐλογητές-proemium of II Cor (1:3–11) characterizes a letter which is directed to a church with which Paul is in open battle over personal matters.”
⁹ Schubert, Form, 12.
¹⁰ Schubert, Form, 39.
changes of literary and historic developments as dynamic phenomena which are caused by the interaction of individuals within communities. Therefore, the social objectivity of exegesis is proportional to the detail with which the persons and events that emerged within the social environment are described. To illustrate the degree of difference, consider Schubert’s conclusion that, “The standards of real intimacy and of genuine formal dignity do not preclude conventionality and fixity of syntactical construction; they require it.” From an ECS perspective, this statement would read: The standards of real intimacy and of genuine formal dignity do not preclude conventionality and fixity of syntactical construction; they often create it.

Gordon Wiles, Shubert’s student, investigated the epistolary and missional function of Paul’s intercessory prayers using a four-fold typology (intercessory wish-prayers; blessings and curses; intercessory prayer reports; prayer requests and exhortations to intercessory prayer) which he derived from “formal and linguistic peculiarities … and peculiar grammatical or syntactical shapes.” His analysis can be summarised as follows.

Paul’s wish prayers contain four elements—God as the subject (variously attributed), a predicate of one or more verbs usually in the optative, a noun or pronoun indicating the beneficiary, and the intercession expressed by a purpose clause (ἵνα, εἰς τό), a καί-clause, or some adjectival or prepositional phrase. Curses and pronouncement blessings employ an imperative verb, the passive voice, and lack an overt divine agent. The magical orientation of this form reflects an amalgamation of Jewish and pagan usage. The formulaic nature of Paul’s opening and closing benedictions lack “spontaneous intercessory significance” that requires a borderline category tangential to the principal wish-prayers. Prayer reports have three formal aspects—a participial verb (sometimes indicative), a prepositional phrase indicating the beneficiary, and the content of the prayer. However, the opening thanksgiving prayer reports have a more standard epistolary function than the “less formal prayer reports” in the letter-body (e.g. 2 Corinthians and

\[\text{11 Schubert, Form, 181.}\]
\[\text{13 Wiles, Prayers, 29–44.}\]
\[\text{14 Wiles, Prayers, 121.}\]
\[\text{15 Wiles, Prayers, 114, 115.}\]
Finally, the fluidity and terseness of Paul’s prayer requests and exhortations to prayer precluded formal analysis. Like Schubert, Wiles says Paul’s use of prayer language cannot be relegated to convention because of how the diverse types of prayer intentionally focus each letter. He finds it formally significant that the wish-prayers and prayer reports “may easily be transposed back into direct prayers by adding the address to God in the vocative case, changing the pronouns or nouns for those to be benefitted from second to third person, and the verb from the subjunctive or infinitive into the imperative mood.” For Wiles, this signifies that Paul intentionally crafted the prayers and prayer reports as templates to guide his audiences in a sublime and sophisticated praxis of corporate and private prayer garnered from Jewish liturgical practice, not epistolary convention. He concludes that Paul adapted epistolary and liturgical precedents for the “more limited epistolary and liturgical purpose … [of] reading to a church community assembled for worship,” and that the typological forms were “carefully composed by the apostle as semi-public prayers” to prepare the audiences for the Eucharist ritual which immediately followed the reading. Opening blessings adapted “the letter right at the start for reading during the eucharist.” Wish prayers conditioned the piety of his audiences for the Eucharist. Curses prepared the audience by addressing a specific crisis with an eschatological prophetic voice. The general epistolary “closing liturgical pattern” of prayer requests and exhortations to prayer gained heightened significance as part of the transition to the Eucharist.

This thesis agrees that Paul’s prayers consistently function to shape the behaviour of his audiences, and that Wiles’ categories are analytically expedient. However, this analysis utilises Wiles’ categories as a usage-based typology to show that embodiment, not the formal analysis of modular structures, determines the typological significance. Although

16 Wiles, Prayers, 157, 229–258.
17 Wiles, Prayers, 260.
18 Wiles, Prayers, 157, 22.
19 Wiles, Prayers, 160–165. Based on the additional assumption that first-century synagogue worship featured highly-developed, standardized prayers.
20 Wiles, Prayers, 9.
22 Wiles, Prayers, 284.
Wiles’ assumptions concerning the nature of the letters and the Eucharistic orientation of Paul’s prayer language are possible, ECS rejects both as necessarily true.

Peter O’Brien adapted Schubert’s formal analysis to show that Paul’s introductory thanksgiving prayers reflect a “deep pastoral and apostolic concern” for his audiences by prefiguring the paraenesis of each letter and creating a didactic pattern for his audiences to imitate.²³ Two major conclusions supported here are that Paul’s “thanksgivings and petitions for believers, known and unknown, were inextricably linked with, and in certain respects moulded by, the proclamation of the gospel, and were therefore connected with his calling as an apostle to the Gentiles;” and “The manifold requests of the apostle are primarily concerned with the growth in Christian maturity of the addressees.”²⁴

The problem with O’Brien is his struggle with structuralism.²⁵ On the one hand, he writes: “Though many structural similarities [between the introductory thanksgivings] have been observed, it is important to realize that ultimately for Paul material considerations were more important than formal ones.”²⁶ On the other hand, he alters Shubert’s typology based on the objectivity of grammar and syntax. For O’Brien, Philippians, Philemon, and Colossians are type Ia which conjoined thanksgiving and petition, 1 Cor 1:4–9 is a stand-alone type Ib, the Thessalonian letters and Romans are mixed types, and 2 Corinthians contains Paul’s “Christianized Berakah prayer from the synagogue liturgy” instead of an epistolary thanksgiving due to its variance from the εὐχαριστέω formula in both terminology and structure.²⁷ Not only is the potential hermeneutic value of describing a ‘Christianized Berakah’ eclipsed by the illegitimate binary relationship to an epistolary thanksgiving, O’Brien’s reclassification lacks logical necessity. Therefore, despite widespread agreement, the main interaction with O’Brien in this analysis argues that his conclusions do not rest on the facts of grammar and syntax, but on the sensorimotor perceptions represented by language.

²³ For O’Brien, Schubert overstated the literary character of Paul’s thanksgiving sections, rendering them “mere literary devices” instead of actual prayers adapted to fit a literary occasion, Thanksgivings, 13–15, 266. Like Wiles, O’Brien reads the vocabulary and tenor of Paul’s thanksgivings and prayer reports as reflecting Paul’s personal prayers, 13, 113 n.19, 114 n.20.

²⁴ O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 209, 270.

²⁵ Potentially indicating the degree to which Shubert’s presuppositions were engrained in Pauline hermeneutics.

²⁶ O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 147.

²⁷ O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 233–239, Paul “uses εὐχαριστέω consistently of Fürdank for God’s work in the lives of the addressees, and εὐλογητός for blessings in which he himself participated.”
2.2) Günther Harder and Adalbert Hamman

Günther Harder and Adalbert Hamman began their investigation of Paul’s prayer language from theological perspectives. Harder’s study, published a year earlier than Schubert’s, but with far less influence, opens with a remark that echoes the fundamental epistemic claim concerning prayer in this analysis: “Das Gebet als Lebensfunktion des religiösen Menschen.”28 Two specific anthropological premises follow. First, the *Gebetsideal* of the first-century worldview was beset by the *Gebetsproblematik* of certainty which required a proper *Gebetshaltung* of attitude, posture, and language to ensure the efficaciousness of prayer.29 Second, ancient *Gebetspraxis* was dependent upon the *Gebetsideal* promoted by formal education and household influence.30

For Harder, the primary distinction between the Jewish and Graeco-Roman *Gebetsideal* was differences in *Gebetsfunktion*. The Jewish *Gebetsfunktion* was an iterative obligatory activity which emerged from an epistemological *Gebetsideal* that God’s self-revelation was accessible in the Psalter. The apocalyptic character of the Psalms imbued the Jewish *Gebetsideal* with an eschatological cast that could dismiss observable conditions as insignificant. In contrast, the Gentile *Gebetsideal* was solely grounded in observable events. Therefore, the Gentile *Gebetsfunktion* was confined to gaining divine beneficence based on immediately perceivable needs. Without an apocalyptic eschatological narrative, the concept of continuous divine activity originating only from the divine will and requiring a prayer response independent of any need or desire was foreign to Graeco-Roman religion.31

Even if there were no other reason than the time and place of Harder’s work, it should be preserved for future generations because of the singular remark: “Die Formen und der Gedankengehalt des christlichen Gebets wachsen aus denen des jüdischen hervor.”32 He asserts that Paul’s Jewishness was the single most important factor in his *Gebetsideal* and *Gebetspraxis*, and that the Jewish *Gebetsideal* meant that Paul’s *Gebetspraxis* was not a searching for God, but a confessional response to the peace inherent in the divine

29 Harder, *Gebet*, 140. Efficaciousness was predominantly dependent upon *die Ordnung der Gebetsreden*.
30 Harder, *Gebet*, 4.
31 Harder, *Gebet*, 146.
32 Harder, *Gebet*, 4.
Heilsgeschichte. Derivatively, Paul’s prayer for ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ was a dynamic force that revealed and executed God’s eschatological work because it developed from the Jewish understanding of κύριος as a proper name for God, and the ascription presumed that God transferred the name to Jesus via the resurrection. Any Hellenistic influence resulted from Paul’s application of prayer to a specific situation which required Paul to make a cognitive or practical connection with his Gentile audience. However, Paul’s perspective of the embodied person of Jesus as the divine apocalyptic eschatology maintained an unassailable separation from his Gentile contemporaries.

Harder’s problem is his idea that Paul’s divergences from Jewish practice which could not be explained as practical applications were indicative of his status as a first century person. Undeniably, Paul and his Gentile contemporaries shared a physical environment in which religious rituals adjudicated observable circumstances, and the concept of a correct Gebetshaltung does arise from the human desire for certainty. Yet, it does not follow from these premises that the gift of the Spirit, as described in Romans 8, represents Paul’s conscious proposal to solve the Gebetsproblematik of the ancient world. Similarly, it is not necessary to attribute Paul’s instructions on head coverings in prayer (1 Cor 11:6–7) to a phenomenon of Gebetsaporie versus Gebetsgewißheit.

In both cases, Harder struggles to reconcile the text with his idea that Paul did not advocate a proper Christian Gebetshaltung. In Romans 8, Harder says the Spirit of God places the one praying in a state of proper Gebetshaltung because the work of God within humanity can only be known through the life of Christ; therefore, the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ/ἐν κυρίῳ constituted a conceptual Christian Gebetshaltung as the necessary confession that the work of Christ is solely the will of God. It is possible that, in each case, the respective communities understood Paul’s intentions as Harder suggested, and that Paul

33 Harder, Gebet, 162.
34 Harder, Gebet, 188–192.
35 Harder, Gebet, 4.
36 Harder, Gebet, 140–146.
37 Harder, Gebet, 163.
38 Harder, Gebet, 151–162. This seems more like a concession to the text than a proposed solution.
39 Harder, Gebet, 183.
consciously exploited such a Gebetsproblematik. However, the necessity of both is precluded.

This study shows that, while there is a degree of naturally emergent circularity in Christianity, it is independent of any external force. The discussion in chapter ten shows that the Gebetsproblematik which Paul addresses in Rome and Corinth is not a matter of certainty, but confusion among the audience concerning the implications of Harder’s astute observation, “Es bezeugt den Betern, daß sie Gottes Kinder sind.”40

Adalbert Hamman characterises his study as a theological treatise, presupposing that Genesis through Revelation “constitue l’unité de l’histoire du salut” which is “établie par le Christ.”41 Like Harder, Hamman claims that spiritual experience is an integrated part of human history, and that the Christian idea of Jesus as the embodied culmination of Jewish history and religion meant that Christian prayer inherently presumed the religious history of Israel. However, Hamman is emphatic that the relationship between Christian and Jewish prayer was one of “continuité et rupture”—continuous because, “il n’existe qu’une prière, celle du peuple de Dieu;” decisively separate because, “l’Alliance nouvelle refond la prière d’Israël dans le creuset du Christ.”42

This thesis supports Hamman’s assertion that Paul’s Damascus Road experience was not a conversion, but a fundamental change in Paul’s religious psyche which created a simultaneous “rupture brutale … et un merveilleux approfondissement de sa foi juive.”43 For Hamman, Paul’s experience was an inaugural vocational vision which, like the historic prophets of Israel, intrinsically entailed prayer by placing the seer in the continual presence of God.44 Hence, Hamman’s assessment of Paul’s revelatory experience: “C’est la raison pour laquelle sa prière fait corps avec son enseignement et affleure en chacune de ses lettres.”45

40 Harder, Gebet, 171.
42 Hamman, Prière, 9–10.
43 Hamman, Prière, 260–261.
44 Hamman, Prière, 265.
45 Hamman, Prière, 326.
However, there are two significant departures from Hamman. First, Paul’s sensorimotor experience of the resurrected Jesus did not fundamentally alter his hermeneutic presuppositions or practice of prayer so that, only afterward, did Paul read the Septuagint and pray the Psalms with a cosmic messianic eschatology.46 The rupture brutale in Paul’s consciousness occurred when he perceived the resurrected Jesus as the embodiment of his fundamental beliefs and practices, and realised that this event introduced a new reality and new possibilities which he could never have anticipated, and yet were retrospectively coherent, if not blatantly obvious. Second, ECS rejects Hamman’s distinction between the ‘interior life’ of prayer and external, Spirit-led, actions designed for the believer to discover the love of God.47 Although this thesis agrees that the ‘centre of gravity’ in Pauline prayer is the eschaton, this dualistic division of the human person is incompatible with the eschaton argued in this analysis.48

2.3) Karl-Heinrich Ostmeyer

There are three reasons that Ostmeyer’s work is a major development in the study of Paul’s prayer language and the point of beginning for this study. First, it is interdisciplinary.49 He applies modern communications research to analyse prayer as a special type of communication—the linguistic realisation of the act of prayer as turning to God (Hinwendung zu Gott).50 This approach entails two critical points: 1) NT prayer (even petitionary) was not motivated by a lack of information or knowledge about God, but the felt need to embody prayer as Hinwendung zu Gott;51 and 2) The exegetical question is not where the phenomenon of prayer appears in the text, but how a text, or group of texts, works out (herausarbeiten) the understanding of prayer as divine-human

47 Hamman, Prière, 250, 294. Also, he incorrectly rejects Paul’s use of παρακαλέω as prayer language, 270. Hamman, Prière, 334.
50 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 31.
communication. This method allows Ostmeyer to acknowledge the contingencies of language, authorial choice, and historical setting, and still articulate a coherent summary Gebetsverständnis, not only for Paul, but for the entire NT corpus: “die Bindung gelingender Kommunikation mit Gott an Christus.”

In fact, the contingencies associated with Paul’s use of prayer language are significant factors in Ostmeyer’s assessment of Paul’s Gebetsverständnis. He points out that Paul repeatedly speaks about prayer, but only directly addresses God via the OT citations in Rom 10:16 and Rom 11:3, which is further complicated by Paul’s liberal and irregular use of the LXX. Most importantly, Paul’s prayer language exemplifies the phenomenon of ‘open ended’ meaning bounded by a theological framework because ‘non-religious’ words (i.e. ἐρωτάω, αἰτέω) signify prayer just as readily as religious terms like προσεύχομαι.

From this position, Ostmeyer offers three summary conclusions concerning Paul’s Gebetsverständnis which are examined in this thesis: 1) Paul’s prayer language describes the possibility of turning to God with such impartiality that “Die Grenzen zwischen religiösem und profanem Bereich verwischen, das „Weltliche” wird hineingenommen in die durch Gott und Christus bestimmte Sphäre;”

2) In Paul’s missional Gebetsverständnis, “Die Menschen, denen Paulus begegnet, werden hineingenommen in seine Gebetsbeziehung zu Gott;”

3) The only sufficient Pauline Oberbegriff for the German term Gebet and the English word prayer is ἐν θεῷ/Χριστῷ/κυρίῳ/πνεύματι—“Sie umfassen jedoch weit mehr als nur die verbalen Formen von Gebet. Mit ihnen wird die gesamte Existenz des Christen umschrieben.”

Second, Ostmeyer describes Paul’s prayer language as a spatiotemporal function of his Gentile mission. He says, “the key to Paul’s Gebetsverständnis” is:

---

52 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 35.
53 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 364, as opposed to “misslingender Kommunikation” (Matt 6:5, 7; Luke 18:11—14).
54 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 40—42.
55 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 45—48. To illustrate the potential hermeneutic significance, he proposes that translating δέησις in Phil. 4:6 as Fürbitte, rather than Flehen, better expresses Paul’s Sprachgewohnheit.
56 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 47.
57 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 78.
58 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 103—105, 94—97.

Therefore, Ostmeyer describes the significance of the blessings in Gal 3:8–14 and Rom 15:27 as, “Der Zutritt zu der Segenssphäre Gottes und damit die Möglichkeit, Segen zu empfangen und selbst zu spenden, wird durch Christus eröffnet.” He says that Paul’s preaching offered others access to the “Sphäre der δόξα Gottes,” and Paul’s defence of the gospel is based on the concept that no part of a Christian’s life existed “außerhalb der δόξα-Sphäre,” because, “Verherrlichungsfreie Räume gibt es für Christen nicht.” As described in the next chapter, ECS affords a hermeneutic that explains why Ostmeyer’s assessment of Paul’s prayer language as a function of time and space is not metaphoric, but an accurate physical description of the prototypical Gebetsfunktion in human cognition and language, and the specific Gebetsfunktion in Paul’s mission.

Third, Ostmeyer’s intends his study to fill a gap in scholarship on prayer: “Im Mittelpunkt bisheriger Untersuchungen zu neutestamentlichen Gebeten … standen vorzugsweise inhaltliche und formal Aspekte. Die Beziehung eines Gläubigen zu Gott, die in der formalen und sprachlichen Gestaltung zum Ausdruck kommt, war bislang nicht Gegenstand einer eigenständigen Untersuchung.” Again, ECS provides a hermeneutic approach for describing Paul’s prayer language as the linguistic emergence of his relationship to God. It is not an anachronistic psychoanalysis for ‘getting into Paul’s mind.’ Analogous to Ostmeyer’s method, this approach presumes that Paul’s letters are embodied instantiations of his conceptualisation of prayer and how it functioned in his

---


60 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 55.

61 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 78.

62 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 78.

mission. Alva Noë calls this the *enactive approach* to the human psyche in which, “An account of consciousness as a natural phenomenon will be a tale, not about the brain, but about our active lives.” Similarly, an account of Paul’s prayer language as a natural phenomenon will be a tale, not about the words, but about the active lives of those involved.

---


Chapter 3) Constructing an Embodied Hermeneutic

In the mid-1990s, Luke Johnson expressed concern that the limits enforced by historical criticism and the hermeneutic of diachronic dependence from the religionsgeschichtliche Schule left exegetes bereft of an “epistemology specifically calibrated to the religious dimensions of human existence” for interpreting the “high proportion of first-order discourse about experience” in the NT.¹ He proposed complementing historical analysis with a phenomenological approach to the religious language and behaviour of early Christianity as an emic dimension of human reality without prescribing a general law or principle.² Most recently, Ellen van Wolde proposed a “cognitive relational approach” which starts from human cognition and brain activity, and focuses on the integrated structures that emerge from “the dynamic interactions of conceptual, textual, linguistic, material, and historical complexes” in which language is the “essential linking and expressive device.”³

Inspired by these scholars, this study proposes a hermeneutic of embodied cognition to focus on Paul’s prayer language as an emergent function of the embodied dynamic interaction between his self-concept and his sensorimotor perception of time and space as he enacted his Gentile mission.⁴ It is historical because it investigates Paul as the Greek-speaking Pharisaic Roman citizen who self-identified as an Apostle of Christ to the Gentiles. It is phenomenal because it describes the emergent properties of his prayer language as the embodied dynamic integration of himself, others, and the environment into his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus. The claim is not that Paul instantaneously acquired the totality of his theology when he perceived the resurrected Jesus, only that his prayer language cannot be interpreted apart from that perception, contingency notwithstanding. As William Campbell says, “Paul’s … response, indeed reaction, to social factors … does not represent the whole of Paul’s theologizing.…


⁴ The term hermeneutic of embodied cognition, most often shortened to embodied hermeneutic, is original to this thesis.
inextricably intertwined, is the Christ-event as a radical new perspective on the actual context and the vital relationships taking place there.”

The first section presents the fundamental concepts of ECS which are germane to this study. Sections 3.2–3.5 discuss the theoretic and heuristic modelling used to construct the embodied hermeneutic. Section 3.6 defines some necessary concepts for applying the hermeneutic to Paul’s prayer language.

3.1) The Fundamental Principles of ECS

The proposed embodied hermeneutic is not an analytical rubric for cognitive analysis, or even a definitive description of ECS. It is an amalgam of insights gathered from a wide range of empiric and theoretic data which, for this thesis, is summarised in these seven principles: 1) The three basic functions of human cognition are pattern-finding, categorisation, and imagination; 2) Cognition is a process of inferring holistic meaning by creatively abstracting prototypical concepts based on sensorimotor experience; 3) The capacity for language is emic to being human; 4) Thought and language are not exact representations of the world, but representations of how sensorimotor data is integrated into an existing meta-narrative; 5) Semantic meaning is not “located” in lexical definition, morphology, or syntax, but is an emergent property of the entire communicative event; 6) Thought and language are necessarily underdetermined, and yet experienced as systematic processes of ordering time and space; 7) The brain is not the central controller for cognition and language.

Based on these principles, an embodied hermeneutic that adjudicates the confluence of biology, the environment, and volition without resorting to some sort of reductionism requires four theoretic parameters: 1) Cognitive and linguistic theories which construe thought and language as emotive, evaluative, and action-oriented, rather than neutral and

---


truth-conditional; 2) Complex dynamic systems theory; 3) A distinction between the ontological and ontic realms of human existence and experience; 4) A heuristic model that allows for direct sensorimotor perception and imaginative extrapolation.7

3.2) Embodied Theories of Cognition and Language

There are three reasons an embodied hermeneutic must adopt cognitive and linguistic theories which are emotive, evaluative, and action-oriented, rather than neutral and truth-conditional. First, it is necessary to distinguish between cognitive and generative views of language. Second, embodied cognition entails paradoxes between language and knowledge, and between language and experience. Third, human thought and language are inherently underdetermined.

Although Cognitive Linguistics developed in response to Transformational Generative Linguistics, these academic fields do not represent different unified theories of language, but different theoretic approaches to the study of language that are characterised by opposing assumptions.8 In the broadest terms, a generative approach is prescriptive, while a cognitive approach is descriptive. The fundamental debate centres around the autonomy of language, which correlates to the nature of grammar and language acquisition. At the risk of sounding overly dramatic, the issue is not merely choosing between competing linguistic theories, but has “everything to do with thought and being human.”9 As Kevin Vanhoozer says, “One’s view of language and literary theory rebounds upon one’s view of human beings.”10

Generative (or transformational) linguistics assumes that language is an autonomous system, governed and acquired by constitutive laws that are independent of human influence.11 “That is, the phonology, syntax, and those aspects of meaning determined by

7 Chemero, *Radical ECS*, 25–43. Rowlands, *Embodied Phenomenology*, 58–61, 82–83. Chemero thinks ECS will always require theoretic pluralism, *Radical ECS*, 16. Theoretic pluralism is not unknown in biblical hermeneutics. Cf. Richard S. Briggs, *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation* (New York: T&T Clark, 2001), 7, “If hermeneutics has taught us anything then it is that one may not say in advance of any interpretive situation which method will be required in order to resolve interpretive difficulties…. there is no short cut by which we may eliminate judgment from the interpretive process.”

8 For an account of the passions involved, see Randy Allen Harris, *The Linguistic Wars* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).


10 Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 203.

its syntactic configuration form a structural system whose primitive terms are not artefacts of a system that encompasses both human language and other human facilities or abilities.” 12 In the generative approach, grammar is modular so that each aspect of language and language acquisition is also an autonomous system governed by its own set of generative laws. “In this view, the superficial complexity of language is a consequence of the interaction of such modules.” 13 The hermeneutic goal of generative linguistics is to discover the mechanical formulas which necessarily define morphology and syntax, and then use these prescriptive laws to uncover what is commonly called the deep structure of a text or discourse. 14

Conversely, cognitive linguistics approaches the nature and function of language with three opposing principles. First, language is not an autonomous cognitive faculty. Second, “Everything from the choice of words and their part of speech to the various inflections and constructions that make up the grammatical structure of an utterance involves conceptualization.” 15 Third, knowledge and mastery of language emerges from language use. 16

Non-autonomy means that the human capacity for language is fully dependent upon the same neurobiology that facilitates all human function. Dirk Geeraerts and Herbert Cuyckens say the term cognitive is essential because it “refers to the crucial role of intermediate informational structures in our encounters with the world.” 17 Croft and Cruse assert that “many word concepts cannot be understood apart from the intentions of the participants or the social and cultural institutions and behaviour in which the action, state, or thing is situated.” 18 However, non-autonomy does not reduce language to an

13 Newmeyer, Grammatical Theory, 3.
14 For an application of transformational grammar to NT Greek see Daryl Dean Schmidt, Hellenistic Greek Grammar and Noam Chomsky, SBLDS 62 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).
15 Croft and Cruse, Cognitive Linguistics, 69.
18 Croft and Cruse, Cognitive Linguistics, 11. Once more Johnson was prescient: “language (in the broadest sense of that term) plays a role not only in the communication of experience to others but also and above all in shaping the experience as it occurs. Language is therefore part of experience’s embodiedness,” Religious Experience, 48.
epiphenomenal by-product of neural processes. Such reductionism would require denying the human capacity for reason and imagination, which is antithetical to cognitive linguistics.

The second cognitive principle means that formal morpho-syntactic considerations are not prescriptive evidence for hermeneutical objectivity, but descriptive procedural markers for the emergence of inferential meaning. This type of processing requires inferential and imaginative reasoning relative to categories based on prototypes. Words, morphology, and syntax are conceptual references of prototypes which are processed and re-presented in increasingly abstract and imagistic details of a perceptual topology that “provide links between different clusters of prototypes in radial categories… and motivate the cross-domain mappings of conceptual metaphors.” In this process, morphology and syntactic patterns are also imagistic abstractions which give more precise direction to the mappings between the words and the image schemas through processes including profiling, metonymy, scope, quantitative and qualitative adjustment, metaphor, grounding, boundedness, perspective, deixis, and scale. Therefore, semantics cannot be predicated upon a truth conditional relationship between language and the world, and the complexity of language cannot be mathematically computed or diagrammed with respect to a model.

Michael Tomasello’s research shows that children do not build meaning up from discrete semantic units, but utilise a “top-down” process of functional reanalysis. Children begin by inferring the holistic intent of the speaker while focusing attention on the topic of conversation, and then adjust their attention and actions based on feedback from the speaker. As their linguistic abilities develop, children use the same feedback loop to

---

19 John Taylor, “Cognitive Linguistics and Autonomous Linguistics,” OHCL, 579, “While Cognitive Linguistics certainly subscribes to the view that language may be grounded in more general cognitive abilities, there is no suggestion that the study of these general abilities makes the study of linguistic structure redundant or that language is an epiphenomenal reflex of general cognitive processes.”


24 Tomasello, Constructing, 75.
focus the attention of their audience on a topic and then adjust language use based on inferred responses of their audience related to their communicative intent. Therefore, children do not acquire language, but develop their inherent linguistic ability as a function of living in a linguistic environment. Furthermore, communication is not a dyadic entailment of speaker and audience, but a triadic process entailing a joint attentional frame created between the speaker, the audience, and an object, event, or idea. Comprehension is the process by which the speaker and audience constantly monitor “each other’s attention both to the object and themselves” until they achieve a mutual understanding. “Syntactic roles such as subject” are not derived from lexical definition, morphology, or syntax, but “emerge naturally from the abstraction process when children apply it across whole, utterance level constructions.”

The main hermeneutic principle is that cognition is derived from embodied experience and construed lexically. One advantage of this principle is that it allows enquiries into potential panhuman cognitive prototypes elicited by a particular communicative event (e.g. Paul’s prayer language). The emphasis is that human biology and language are coordinate functions which exert some level of reciprocal constraints that are necessary for human life. Therefore, language cannot be a postnatal cognitive faculty acquired by a process of internalising a pre-existent, external grammar generated by truth conditions independent of human thought and action. Instead, the capacity for language is an emic property of the embodied person and language use is an emergent process of living.

A second advantage to the principle that sensorimotor perception of integrated units is the point of origin for cognition and language, is that it can accommodate Robert de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler’s observation that, “Humans are evidently capable of intricate reasoning processes that traditional logics cannot explain: jumping to conclusions, pursuing subjective analogies, and even reasoning in the absence of knowledge.” Neurobiological studies show that this is not a special or sporadic

25 Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar*, 27, “At the core of grammatical meanings are mental operations inherent in these elemental components of moment-to-moment living.”


27 Tomasello, *Constructing*, 163.

28 Thus, the human capacity for language cannot separate humanity from the rest of creation by means of simple addition because it indicates a mental difference in kind, not just degree.

characteristic of human cognition, but a description of normal cognitive function. Semantic processing always begins with a conclusion followed by a subjective analogy in the absence of knowledge because normative sensorimotor perception detects integrated units prior to the awareness of constituent parts. In a 2012 study, Edward Wlotko and Kara Federmeier concluded:

> semantic processing begins before all relevant information is available, but seems to be modulated by whatever contextual information is currently available … in advance of any bottom-up stimulation when words are predictable are findings revealing that when relevant information becomes available later in the processing stream, the initial meaning representation may be revised or reshaped.

As a result of this process, language is employed with the assumption that it comprises an integrated unit of coherent communication. This creates (as termed here) the language-knowledge paradox and the language-experience paradox. The language-knowledge paradox refers to the tendency for people to overestimate their knowledge because what they know is always greater than what they can articulate. The language-experience paradox is created by the assumption that thought and language are exact representations of the objects and events that inhabit the human environment. The paradox is that this assumption is necessary to initiate, evaluate, and refine language use, even when the indirect, unreliable, and limited nature of language and cognition are recognised. In other words, the assumption of coherence is necessary to achieve understanding, even when the subject of discussion is considered incoherent.

Studies also show that thought and language are necessarily underdetermined. Underdetermination is not simply the constant potential to be mistaken. It is the scientific principle “that the evidence available to us at a given time may be insufficient to determine what beliefs we should hold in response to it.” For example, in the process of


interpersonal interaction, cognition, language, and behaviour phenomenally emerge towards structuralism and synchronicity. In some instances, groups exhibit collective cognition, even at the level of object identification. Therefore, underdetermination is only negative within a reductionist hermeneutic. In an embodied hermeneutic, underdetermination only eliminates the possibility of determining the prescriptive localisation of meaning (this word means…). It does not eliminate the potential of a plausible description of meaning distributed across a wide spectrum of dynamically integrated structures (Paul was saying…). In fact, the latter is only possible because cognition and language are necessarily underdetermined by being grounded in, and partially determined by, a sensorimotor perceptive ability which has spatiotemporal limits for gathering data and categorical limits for accommodating the nuanced semantic range of human experience, imagination, and volition. Therefore, the human brain is not analogous to a computer, nor is human language analogous to the binary algorithm of machine language or even the most advanced programming language. Hence the need for complex adaptive systems theory.

3.3) Complex Adaptive Systems Theory

Complex adaptive systems theory (aka complexity theory) is crucial to this study because it describes human cognition and behaviour as dynamic functions of human volition and the constraints of embodiment and socio-cultural environments. A complex system cannot be reduced to the sum of its parts because the “system’s identity is given by the coordinated organization of the processes that make it up, not the primary material of its components.” A complex adaptive system originates and develops as a feedback loop “in which the product of the process is necessary for the process itself.” This means the system is self-organised and self-regulated at the dynamic interface of the individual parts without the benefit of a central controller. Self-organisation, self-regulation, and system


34 See Chemero, Radical ECS, 166–169.

35 According to Alicia Juarrero, “Understanding human action must begin from the assumption that people are dynamical entities whose behavior reflects their complexity,” Dynamics in Action: Intentional Behavior as a Complex System (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1999), 221.


37 Juarrero, Dynamics, 5.
identity emerge as the individual parts work together to constitute the whole, which, in
turn, exercises a distributed constraining force on the parts.

This process produces three characteristics of complex adaptive systems that are
fundamental to this study: Entrainment, Tolerable Variation, and Bifurcation.

Entrainment is the tendency of individual parts within the system to synchronise over time
proportional to physical proximity and similarity of purpose. Tolerable Variation is the
level of dissonance, and even antagonism, that can exist between the individual parts
without threatening the identity or functionality of the system. If a complex adaptive
system is pressed beyond its tolerable variation, a systemic phase-change occurs. An
independent bifurcation that radically transforms the original system while retaining some
of its structure emerges from a phase-change that achieves “a higher level of complexity
characterized by renewed potential and possibilities.”

This is not an evaluative comparison. A bifurcation cannot survive simply because it is a
radical departure from the original system. It must attain a certain level of self-
organisation and self-regulation that achieves coherence between the radical change and
the retained aspects of the original system. In such cases, Juarrero says, “The historical
interpretation must provide detailed descriptions of the singular incidents that the agent
experienced and that both precipitated the transformation and served as the nucleus around
which the bifurcation reorganized.” Not only are complex adaptive systems inherently
self-causative and circular, their behaviour and development are unpredictable by
governing laws or by simple reference to their initial conditions, even though these
systems “embody in their very structure the conditions under which they were created.”

Thus, complex adaptive systems can only be studied and interpreted by a narrative
retrospective description of their behaviour and development as what did happen, not what
must have happened.

The argument, which begins in Part II, is that 2T Judaism and Graeco-Roman socio-
cultural religion were distinct complex adaptive religious systems with differing degrees
of entrainment and tolerable variation, and Christianity was an emergent bifurcation from
2T Judaism predicated upon the historic transformational events described in the Christ-

38 Juarrero, Dynamics, 9.
39 Juarrero, Dynamics, 9.
40 Juarrero, Dynamics, 8, 220.
narrative and how that narrative was subsequently interpreted and applied. Therefore, as a
function of his mission, Paul’s prayer language was a nested complex adaptive system
which contributed to the development of the complexity necessary for Christianity to
survive because it was framed by his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus.
Complexity theory also explains how his creative and variegated use of the Christ-
narrative, his Jewish tradition, and the Graeco-Roman sociocultural religious expression
could sustain a level of tolerable variation.

3.4) Differentiating Ontological and Ontic Aspects of Human Existence

This study modifies Murphy-O’Connor’s use of Heidegger’s ontological and ontic
categories because the primary Pauline hermeneutic conundrum does not originate in what
Paul said, but in the rupture brutale of his sensorimotor perception.41

The ontological level is constituted by the range of possibilities that make up human
nature, and on this level Jesus is absolutely identical with all others of the human
race. The difference with which Paul was concerned comes on the ontic level, the
domain of real existence in which those possibilities appear as actualised or not
actualised…. Had Christ not been ‘different’ we could never have been convinced
that the mode of existence evidenced by the world was not the only option open to
humanity.42

To restate the thesis in terms of the embodied hermeneutic describe thus far, Paul’s
sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus constituted a restructured ontology of
human existence in which death no longer existed. All that remained was eternal physical
life in the physical world in which Paul was living and in which Jesus had been
resurrected. However, Paul was not delusional. He understood that the ontic human
experience remained structured by sin and death. Yet, he was convinced that the life-
structured ontology wrought by the resurrection of Jesus presented new ontic possibilities
which could be actualised amidst an ontic human condition constrained by death,
primarily because the life-structured ontology entailed an ontological solidarity that was
immune to ontic human action. Even so, actualising the new ontic possibilities of the life-
structured ontology remained constrained by human volition. Therefore, his mission, and
the formative aspect of his prayers in that mission, was the embodied manifestation of his
own participation in the life-structured ontology as he guided others to do the same,

41 See review of Hamman in 2.2.

(Atlanta: SBL Press, 2009), 79. For the position that some adaptation of Heidegger is helpful for ECS, see
despite their sensorimotor experience in which death remained a constant threat. The question is, how would such a task be possible?

3.5) The Heuristic: Conceptual Blending Theory

Conceptual Blending Theory (CBT) describes thought and language as processes for ‘Attaining Human Scale’—rendering experience, needs, and desires in a “human-scale scenario, with a minimal number of agents in a local spatial region and a small temporal interval.” Creating a human-scale scenario is a process of compressing vast and diffuse arrays of concepts and events into manageable constructs for sound judgment and effective communication that involve “direct action and perception inside familiar frames, … and direct intentionality.” Because human sensorimotor faculties are experienced as direct interaction with integrated objects and events, there is no prescriptive criteria for this process. CBT describes successfully attaining human scale as “the level at which it is natural for us to have the impression that we have direct, reliable, and comprehensive understanding.” Rather than a capitulation to inevitable subjective vagary, this description is reflective of the fact that people always know more than they can articulate. What follows is a summary of the aspects of CBT which are most germane to this project.

In CBT, the three basic attributes of human perception and cognition are alliterated as Identity, Integration, and Imagination. Identity is the ability to detect sameness. Integration is the ability to conceive an object or event as a singular whole without reference to its constituent parts. Imagination signifies the process of extrapolating conceptual data for further uses. A significant derivative attribute of these three is the ability for counterfactual thinking— the ability to imagine the opposite conditions of a concept or statement (e.g. sameness/difference, coherent/incoherent, tactile/ethereal, visible/invisible, etc.).

---


44 Fauconnier and Turner, *Conceptual Blending*, 322.

45 Fauconnier and Turner, *Conceptual Blending*, 323.

46 The aspect of scope in CBT is omitted because it is not necessary to the goals of this study.
Conceptual blends are distinguishable from linguistic devices such as metaphor, simile, and hyperbole. The latter are figurative expressions which communicate transcendent reality related to previous experience. A conceptual blend processes and communicates the transcendent reality as ontically accessible. A relatively easy example is the typical response to a child’s first encounter with a mirror: “That is you in the mirror.” Even though the child is not, and cannot be, contained in the mirror, the reflection cannot be properly categorised as an image, representation, or symbol. The mirror provides the child with an ontological perspective which is no less real than her normal, non-reflective, visual perspective. What the mirror provides is an avenue of direct access to the child’s self-perception which is otherwise ontically unavailable. As is often the case, the point of the mirror blend “is not to obscure incompatibilities but, in a fashion, to have at once something and its opposite.”

This scenario is also an example of what CBT deems *living in the blend* — using the global insight offered by the blend to be self-evident while ignoring the network of mental spaces that comprise the blend. In the mirror example, the importance of self-awareness renders differentiating between the physical child and the reflected image insignificant. Because people can shift focus between the global insight offered by a blend and the awareness of a larger cognitive network, the concept of living in a blend is not equal to fantasising or self-delusion. Living in a blend is the ability to create a human scale scenario for pragmatic purposes. People create and live in blended spaces when their productive interface with others and the environment requires blending mechanical and teleological logical forms. Fauconnier and Turner’s example is the statement, “Joseph was the father of Jesus.” They write:

In this blend, we do not project the usual structure of the father’s role in procreation or the nonvirginity of the mother. But we can project family structure and emotions. We also know that the communities of people in which they lived largely took Joseph to be Jesus’ father in every way … this use of “father” is not felt to be metaphoric or analogical.

The point is that conceptual blending is not a simple matter of rearranging cognitive data, but creating functionally integrated and coherent concepts which are not available in the


48 Issues as divergent as family members making end of life decisions for a comatose patient, to determining legal competence to stand trial, to assessing what constitutes an act of war or a doctrine of theological heresy are all decided by participants living in a blend.

individual input spaces. Even as adults, mirrors are never felt to be analogic or metaphorical. Despite our knowledge of reflective mechanics, the teleological need to find ourselves in the mirror remains.

The basic terms used in CBT to describe the blending process are: mental spaces, selective projection, cross-space mapping, vital relations, compression and scaling, organising frames, running the blend, and entrenched conceptual integration networks.

Due to embodiment, CBT conceptualises the cognitive process in terms of four mental spaces. At least two input spaces containing sufficiently specific knowledge are connected to a generic space containing conceptual prototypes. The blended space contains the new concept that creatively combines selective aspects of the input spaces through prototypical associations. A blended space is analogous to a bifurcated complex system because it disproportionately retains some of the structure of the input spaces to develop a genuinely independent concept. For example, the statement, “God is my rock” is based upon the input spaces God and rock as they are potentially related to the generic spaces STABILITY or IMMOVABLE, or both. In the blend, only the attributes of a rock that denote sufficient size, weight, and hardness, are selected, but not colour, shape, or texture. Similarly, the concept of omnipotence is projected from the God input space, but not omniscience.

Selective projection refers to this partial and disproportionate use of the input spaces to create a desired meaning which is not otherwise able. It is important to understand that the input spaces are unaffected by the selective projections used to form the blended spaces. This allows the biblical text to assign the diverse roles of father, rock, and fortress to God, and still maintain a singular divine identity that is not role dependent.

---


51 It is customary linguistic practice to designate prototypical categories with all caps. The small cap font seemed best aesthetically suited for this project.
Cross-space mapping is the process of identifying which structures in each input space must be retained to create the desired blend. In CBT parlance, this means detecting the vital relations that connect each input space to the generic space. Examples of vital relations include: Change, Identity, Time, Space, Cause-Effect, Role, Property, and Category. In the blended space, the vital relations that connect the input spaces to the generic space are “strengthened,” or “tightened,” by compression and scaling within an organising frame available in the input spaces. “An organizing frame provides a topology for the space it organizes; that is, it provides a set of organizing relations among the elements in the space.” Potential organising frames emerge along a conceptual spectrum that includes prototypical frames and several degrees of more specific frames. Therefore, organising frames are also subject to selective projection and cross-mapping.

Running the blend describes two concepts. First, it refers to the explicit or implicit motion that is invested in the blend, which is a key element for determining the attitude and purpose of the speaker. Second, it refers to the actual perception of the time, space, and motion within the blended space as it is processed into an integrated concept. This is a key element for describing the potential effect a blend may have on an audience.

Finally, an Entrenched Conceptual Integration Network (ECIN) describes objects, events, or beliefs that have conceptual and formal structures which are shared across a community. Analogous to complexity theory, ECINs provide stable organizing points which can tolerate a certain amount of variation. They are important because “a connection cannot be made active unless it first exists or is constructed. Different connections that might be made active vary on their degree of entrenchment and on how easy it is to activate them in any given moment.” As shown at several points in the study, the significance of an ECIN can only be determined by analysing how it is used, and not merely on the merits of its existence.

---

52 See Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 89–106 for their full list, which is not considered exhaustive.

53 Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 123.

54 Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 167.
3.6) The Conceptual Constructs for Applying an Embodied Hermeneutic

Applying the proposed embodied hermeneutic to Paul’s prayer language requires describing five conceptual constructs: the generic spaces RELIGION and PRAYER, the specific framing narrative for Paul’s prayer language, his category metamorphosis of being human, and linear versus emergent time.

A) The Generic Space RELIGION

The generic mental space RELIGION organises observable phenomena into human scale scenarios which allow the consideration and discussion of what is otherwise inexplicable and beyond human control with the impression of direct access and global insight. RELIGION achieves human scale with a cause-effect schema between a divine agent and the ontic level of human experience by compressing MORALITY and ETHICS into polarities like good/evil, right/wrong, and sacred/profane so that individuals, people groups, and events can be evaluated. Rituals maintain the positive pole and potentiate change at the negative pole. The complexity necessary for a specific religious expression to survive is a function of how rituals interact with the generic RELIGION space based on a specific narrative.

B) The Generic Space PRAYER

The generic mental space PRAYER facilitates the direct and global experience of communication between physical beings of limited means and ability and an ethereal being of potentially unlimited means and ability. PRAYER elicits a human-scale scenario by compressing space and time to make the divine agent accessible via sensorimotor perception. Identity compression creates idealised spaces for the person praying and the deity with whom communication is achieved. Specific prayers compress these IDENTITY prototypes into specific roles (e.g. petitioner, intercessor), and further compress these roles into categories (e.g. priest, priestess, god of war, god of fertility).

Space compression invests physical places, either constructed (temples, synagogues) or natural (groves, rivers), with the presence of the divine agent. Linguistically, space compression is achieved by invoking the presence of the divine agent. In many cases, the language of place coincides with the physical space dedicated for prayer. That is, prayers

55 Contra Von Thaden, *Embodied Cognition*, 47, the generic space is not too theoretical to be analytically useful. Admittedly, identifying generic spaces is difficult and tentative because the property “generic” is relative. Nonetheless, it is a necessary process because attempting to identify generic spaces helps illustrate that abstracting prototypes is fundamental for human cognition. Defining generic spaces does not reduce blends to cognitive sets.
which invoke the presence of the deity would be considered effective when uttered in the proper physical space.

The time compression required for PRAYER to give the impression of direct and global access entails a certain level of tension. On the one hand, PRAYER prototypically compresses the moment of any specific prayer and the moment of its resolution into a single event. Yet, time compression can also invest the divine/human interaction with an ideal trajectory of motion that is constrained by the content of a specific prayer (e.g. petition, intercession, blessing, cursing). Sometimes this motion is mapped from an observable input space, other times it must be derived from the context of the blend.

PRAYER is organised by the prototypical frames DIALOGUE and TRANSACTION. If the expected response is an action other than a verbal reply, only part of the DIALOGUE frame is projected into the prayer blend. TRANSACTION is elicited when the expected response involves goods or services to be transacted between the divine agent and human recipients. If reciprocity is not present in the blend, then the TRANSACTION frame is only partially projected. The spatial separation between the petitioner and the deity, the temporal separation between requests and answers, and the counterfactual tension inherent in hearing, or otherwise detecting, the divine response always remain in conflict with these two organizing frames.

As the mental space that facilitates divine/human interaction, PRAYER is a cognitive necessity for religion to render that interaction at human scale because it compresses the entirety of the divine/human relationship into a defined act which can be experienced, mutually processed, elaborated, adapted, and repeated. However, PRAYER only contains the potential for divine/human communication, but nothing concerning attributes such as willingness, benevolence, and intentionality.

C) The Organising Frame for Paul’s Prayer Language

This thesis claims that the specific frame for Paul’s prayer language is the Christ-covenant as mediated by the Christ-narrative. The term Christ-narrative approximates Nils Dahl’s term Christological language which he defines as “shorthand for what those who believed in Jesus after his death said about him, as well as for the ways in which they spoke about him.”56 The term Christ-covenant denotes the singular conceptual construct of the

emerging life-structured ontology. In other words, the Christ-narrative is the story and the Christ-covenant is the experience.

Though Matthew Novenson is correct that Judaism did not contain “a widespread, coherent Jewish messianic worldview in which Paul’s messianism is largely scripted for him,” it is not quite accurate to say that “there was nothing at all inevitable about the form that Paul’s messiah language took,” or that the Pauline corpus is “a wealth of corroborating evidence—and some altogether new evidence—for diverse strands of messianism in ancient Judaism.”⁵⁷ While there was nothing inevitable about the precise morpho-syntactic structure of Paul’s messianic language, his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus gave it a unique developmental identity and trajectory. Similarly, Ian Scott rightly says, “Somewhere at its roots the Christian movement seems to have been shaped by a kind of thinking very unlike the rationalisms which characterised Lucian’s Roman philosophy and modern European thought after Descartes.”⁵⁸ Yet, his conclusion concerning Paul’s logic is suspect: “Even Gentile citizens of the Roman world could thus be pushed quite rationally to adopt the new Christian message if they found that it accounted more coherently for their experience of the world, both mundane and miraculous.”⁵⁹ Despite Paul’s high view of human rationality and his well-reasoned arguments, nothing about his gospel was a coherent explanation of the current human experience, either mundane or miraculous. Instead, Paul’s gospel presented an alternative human experience in which the miraculous had subsumed the mundane at the most basic point of human existence—the state of being alive.

D) Paul’s Category Metamorphosis of Being Human

The unique developmental identity that emerges in Paul’s prayer language is a category metamorphosis for the human person. In CBT, a category metamorphosis occurs when “the entire structure and organising principles have been dramatically altered,” but the linguistic reference is unchanged.⁶⁰ This means that Paul redefined Jews, Gentiles, and even himself in ways which reflected the complexity of emergent Christianity as a

⁵⁹ Scott, Implicit Epistemology, 283.
⁶⁰ Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 270.
bifurcation from 2T Judaism and the Graeco-Roman socio-cultural complex religious system without changing the names. Fauconnier and Turner say that a category metamorphosis has the specific function of transferability. Here, this is the process that allows a bifurcated system to retain some of the structure of the parent system and infuse it with a distinct level of complexity. The analysis shows that Paul’s prayer language manifested a cosmic category metamorphosis which retained the physical structure within his sensorimotor experience, but redefined it in terms of the absolute value of life which he understood to be explicitly manifested in the physical person of Jesus.62

E) Linear Time vs. Emergent Time

The unique developmental trajectory that emerges in Paul’s prayer language redefines the concept of time from linear to emergent. The implied motion in Paul’s prayer language should be understood as a rising tide rather than a journey from point A to point B. This perspective addresses Wright’s concern that that sociological and religious categories have been relentlessly substituted for eschatological ones.63

The position taken in this study is that the cognitive dissonance inherent in the ‘already-and-still-coming’ description of God’s salvific Heilsgeschichte was the main catalyst for Christianity’s bifurcation from 2T Judaism and inherent conflict with the Graeco-Roman religious concept. The problem is that familiarity and compactness of the phrase ‘already-and-not-yet’ clarifies and clouds the spatiotemporal impact of Paul’s message. The problem is not with the phrase itself. There may not be a better way to express Paul’s presentation of the crucifixion, resurrection, and parousia of Jesus as individually significant and complete works of God, and simultaneously interdependent parts of a process which was not universally available to direct sensorimotor perception.64 The problem is that the limitations of our embodiment, particularly the fact that our predominant sense of time is linear, make it exceptionally difficult to perceive ‘already-

61 Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 270.

62 Here the term absolute value equates intrinsic value. The analogy is when the intrinsic/absolute value of a company is calculated on the assumption that its current revenue stream is indicative of its future cash flow. Hence, the absolute value of life manifested by the resurrection of Jesus is the intrinsic value of an eternally inviolable physical life.


64 These terms are not used as punctiliar moments, but as summary terms for emergent events that comprise the Christ covenant as a complex adaptive system (i.e., Incarnation is the story of Jesus from birth to death, Resurrection includes the Ascension. Parousia encompasses the physical return of Jesus and the physical resurrection of the dead without any dispensational reference).
and-not-yet’ as an integrated unit. Allocating for the salvific sufficiency of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus tends to obscure the teleological trajectory of the parousia. In turn, allocating for the teleological trajectory of the parousia tends to obscure the salvific sufficiency of the crucifixion and resurrection as particular historic events. This problem extends further back than the Enlightenment, the Renaissance, or the edict of Milan. It is the primary problem presented by the Christ-narrative which claims to be the singular space into which everything else must be integrated without reductionism.

3.7) Conclusion

Prayer blends have two main functions for living in a complex adaptive religious system: accessibility and participation. In a bifurcated religious system, prayer blends extract regularities from the original system and transform them into categories that develop the complexity necessary for the new system to survive. Conflicts with the original system are either not mapped, or exploited to create further complexity.

This study employs an embodied hermeneutic to show why and how Paul’s prayer language conceptualised his mission in terms of an intrinsic motion that integrated the ontic human experience into the new emerging life-structured Christological ontology. This approach is a process of describing how Paul’s use of prayer language achieved human scale scenarios for this categorical metamorphosis of being for humanity. It includes: 1) Describing Paul’s prayer language as conceptual blends framed by the Christ-narrative and prototypically connected to the Christ-covenant; 2) Understanding that there is a gap between how people experience language as direct access and global insight into their sensorimotor environment and the way language actually functions as an emergent representation of that environment; 3) Understanding that, while embodied cognition constrained these prototypical connections to some degree, Paul’s prayer language naturally emerged as a function of the complexity involved in organising his mission around the new possibilities and potentials presented by the Christ-covenant; and 4) Paul’s prayer language was a function of the natural and necessary level of complexity required for emergent Christianity to survive as an independent complex adaptive religious system in the first-century Mediterranean context.

65 The situation is analogous to Werner Heisenberg’s 1927 discovery that he could not simultaneously measure the speed and position of a particle because measuring one necessarily negates the other. See David Lindley, Uncertainty: Einstein, Heisenberg, Bohr, and the Struggle for the Soul of Science (New York: Doubleday, 2007).
A prevailing question in Pauline studies is how to balance the competing forces that shaped Paul as a historical person and his letters as historical documents. Does his language reflect Schubert’s opinion that, “Paul was not just a Jew who was ‘exposed’ to Hellenistic ‘influences’, but … an indigenous Hellenist normally assimilated to those strata of Hellenistic society,” or Graeme Goldsworthy’s assessment that, "Paul understands his mission to the Gentiles within the context of his being a Hebrew of the Hebrews”?¹ Or, does Paul’s language represent, as Wright says, “a different kind of thing from what it had been before in the world either of the Jews or the pagans” because it met “a previously unknown need”?²

Part II shows why Paul’s prayer language was not a unique religious expression in the first-century Mediterranean context, and yet it was distinct from both 2T Jewish prayer and Graeco-Roman sociocultural religious expressions. The next two chapters show how Paul disproportionately blended aspects of Graeco-Roman sociocultural religious expression emic to human religious experience with his Jewish prayer tradition into his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus. Therefore, interpreting Paul’s prayer language is not a quantifiable comparative process, but a scaled qualification of how it partially mapped 2T Jewish prayer and Graeco-Roman prayer into the emergent complexity of the Christ-narrative.


² Wright, P&FG, 1:26.
This chapter uses the recurrent issue of ancient epistolary-rhetorical analysis to illustrate that Paul’s prayer language was not unique in comparison to Graeco-Roman socio-religious expression, and yet was distinctly Christian. The first section explains why Graeco-Roman sociocultural expression constituted a complex adaptive religious system.1 The second section discusses the relationship between embodied cognition and ancient epistolary-rhetorical analysis. The third section discusses the emergence of a distinct Christian and/or Pauline epistolary prayer rhetoric as a function of the emergent complexity of Paul’s mission.

4.1) Graeco-Roman Sociocultural Expression as a Complex Adaptive Religious System

Graeco-Roman religion is often characterised as “a system in which choices of religious belief and practice were non-exclusive, open-ended, and virtually limitless.”2 If this were accurate, then Graeco-Roman religion could not be described as a complex adaptive system. Admittedly, the diversity of non-Jewish religious expression in the first century means that the category Gentile is only legitimate as a binary companion to the category Jewish. Yet, the singular term Graeco-Roman sociocultural religion is supported by Wright’s balanced corrective to the assertion that Graeco-Roman religions were unconditionally tolerant,3 and archaeological evidence that religion played a central role in the public and private expression of self-identity, cultural mores, and civic order.4 Recent scholarship on Graeco-Roman guilds and associations shows that socialisation, commerce, religion, and politics were indistinguishably intertwined in a worldview of benefaction and reciprocity.5 The multiplicity of large temples, elaborate festivals, publicly dedicated

---

1 Yet, in agreement with John M. G. Barclay, Paul and the Gift (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 24, “The hybrid adjective “Greco-Roman”… gestures to the complexity of the Mediterranean world in the first century, where the overlay of Roman political power onto “Greek” traditions created a complex and socially layered interaction of cultural traditions, changing over time and varying from East to West.”


3 Wright, P&FG, 1:246–257. The fact that Socrates was convicted of atheism illustrates at least one choice that was not tolerated.


5 Philip A Harland, Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 115–160.
steles, and demarcated worship spaces in association buildings suggests that a high value was placed on the visibility of religious expression in Graeco-Roman culture, and that sacrifices and prayers were defined by spatiotemporal definitions for the concept and practice of worship.\textsuperscript{6}

Acts of cult worship [were] performed in a range of civic and private settings on certain basic assumptions: that a plurality of gods exists, however systematically or vaguely their relationship to one another and to humans is envisaged; that they are powerful forces in the world and must be honoured appropriately with prayer and sacrifice; and that in return they can be expected to help and favour those who worship them, showing themselves through oracles, dreams, and omens.\textsuperscript{7}

Graeco-Roman sociocultural expression functioned as a complex adaptive religious system by achieving human scale scenarios for organising the phenomenal aspect of human ontology within the ontic realm of human experience. The claim is not that a common narrative united the diverse Graeco-Roman religious expressions, but that neither philosophy nor political theory could overcome, or fully appreciate, the emic nature of religious expression in human experience.\textsuperscript{8} Despite challenges by philosophers such as Archilochus of Paros (7\textsuperscript{th} c. BC), Xenophanes (ca. 570–488 BC), and Protagoras (490–415 BC), Greek and Roman mythologies permeated education and culture from Herodotus to Seneca, and were easily reinvigorated by Emperor Julian.\textsuperscript{9} The reason is not simply that Graeco-Roman religious attitudes changed at a slow pace.\textsuperscript{10} As the next section illustrates, human behaviour, including religious expression, defies categorical analysis and reductionist interpretation, no matter how reasonable.


\textsuperscript{8} Cicero said, “there is no subject on which the learned as well as the unlearned differ so strenuously as this.” (\textit{De natura deorum} 1.2). Although Polybius praised the Romans for their religious devotion, he also viewed religious expression as necessary to civic order: “But as the masses are always fickle, filled with lawless desires, unreasoning anger and violent passions, they can only be restrained by mysterious terrors or other dramatizations of the subject” (\textit{His.} 6:56). Conversely, Lucretius passionately attempted to “loose men’s minds from the tight knots of superstition” (\textit{De rerum natura} 4.7).


\textsuperscript{10} Smith, \textit{Julian’s Gods}, xv.
4.2) Embodied Cognition and the Allure of Epistolary-Rhetorical Criticism

Quite simply, Schubert’s conclusion that ancient epistolary units were “a conditio sine qua non of letter writing”\textsuperscript{11} is a reasonable product of human cognition—identifying patterns and imaginatively abstracting prototypes. There is sufficient extant data that Graeco-Roman letters, including Paul’s, emerged in a pattern of a prescript (identifying the sender and recipient), a greeting and/or health prayer, information/requests/instructions, and a farewell which was often a benediction.\textsuperscript{12} Additionally, there are two surviving epistolary handbooks (\textit{Demetrius}, ca. 200 BC–AD 300, and \textit{Libanius}, ca. 4\textsuperscript{th} c.–6\textsuperscript{th} c. AD) which coordinate Graeco-Roman rhetoric (forensic, deliberative, epideictic) with cultural mores (friendship, family, patron-client, introductory, etc.), as well as evidence that speeches were intentionally structured according to rhetorical social context (Isocrates, \textit{Paneg.} 4.11; Demosthenes, [\textit{Erot.}] 61.2, \textit{Exord.} 1—which contains rationale for violating such propriety).

However reasonable and natural, Shubert’s conclusion oversimplifies the problem that Paul’s letters were not speeches, but open letters to specific communities. It also elicits adjectives such as “formulaic,” “stereotyped,” and “standard,” which relegate any units so designated to marginally significant stock phrases that filled slots in a predetermined form, and places the exegetical focus “on the letter of the body for discerning theological meaning, social engagement, and rhetorical strategies.”\textsuperscript{13} Note Witherington and Hyatt on Rom 1:8–15: “It is clear in this \textit{exordium} either that Paul has little he wishes to thank God for about the Roman Christians or that he is simply eager to get on with the discourse;” so that, ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος was a

\textsuperscript{11} Schubert, \textit{Form}, 25.

\textsuperscript{12} P.Mich. 8.479 is a sufficient exemplar: Claudius Terentianus to Claudius Tiberianus, his father and lord, very many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and prosperity, which are my wish. I marvel that after you sailed upcountry you did not write to me about your well-being, but until today I have been anxious because you were indisposed when you left me. Please, then, write me a reply at once concerning your well-being. You will deliver to Tabetheus the letter of the dioiketes for the strategos, and let her make every effort to deliver it to the strategos at once, so that he may reply quickly to what has been written to him. I also was intending to sail up, but until today I have not yet disposed of my affairs, which remain unsettled. And if you know about Nemesianus, where he is staying, write to me, since we are anxious about him too. All my people salute you. Salute all your friends, each by name. I pray for your good health. (Verso) To his most esteemed Claudius Tiberianus from Claudius Terentianus. (APIS Translation)

\textsuperscript{13} Philip L. Tite, “How to Begin, And Why,” in \textit{Paul and the Ancient Letter Form}, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, PS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 97–98. Cf. Richard N. Longenecker, \textit{Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul’s Most Famous Letter} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 173, “Another characteristic of ancient oral communication, whether poetry or prose, is that it was heavily formulaic in nature—that is, that it incorporated and constructed its presentation around various formal statements or affirmations of the day.”
rhetorical redundancy designed to make the Romans feel how much Paul cared for them and make his assertion of authority palatable.\textsuperscript{14}

Even attempts to mitigate the \textit{conditio sine qua non} in epistolography and rhetoric retain a functionalist understanding of cognition and language that reduces authorship to arranging language blocks which have an independent existence from human personality and intention. For example, T. Y. Mullins correctly said, “The way we characterize these forms … affects the very substance of critical analysis of the material,” and that epistolary forms were not a thematic ploy, but a social gesture that genuinely showed “the writer’s attitude toward the audience.” Yet, he mistakenly asserted that epistolary forms did not show the author’s “attitude toward the material he is presenting.”\textsuperscript{15} Thus, Mullins evaluated epistolary forms as “punctuated thought,” or “clustering places” for less important information than that in the letter body. Openings were “a sort of warm-up to the main issue,” and closings were “matters of minor importance … before breaking off.”\textsuperscript{16}

Hans-Josef Klauck proposed a similar pseudo-mitigation concerning the influence of the ancient epistolary handbooks:

In practice there are no model letters … Rather, each letter draws from the stock of formulas, adapts the existing letter template for its own purposes, and also includes distinctive material depending on the specific situation and the individuality of

\textsuperscript{14} Ben Witherington III and Darlene Hyatt, \textit{Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 42–43. Cf. Bruce Winter, “The Importance of the "Captatio Benevolentiae" In the Speeches of Tertullus And Paul In Acts 24: 1—21," \textit{JTS} 42 (1991): 505–531. Often credited to Cicero (\textit{De or.} 2.115, 2.128), the term \textit{captatio benevolentiae} does not appear. An interesting parallel to this study is Sarah Dubina, “First and Lasting Impressions: The Didactic and Dialogic \textit{Exordia} of Apuleius’ \textit{Florida}” (MA Thesis, The Graduate School of The Ohio State University, 2010), 8–9. She says \textit{captatio benevolentiae} is not a classical term, but is well attested in Aristotle’s and Quintilian’s respective discussions of \textit{prooemia} and \textit{exordia}. Furthermore, “The term was closely associated with the formalities of letter writing (\textit{ars dictaminis}), and first use of the term does not appear until the publication of Alberic of Monte Cassino’s \textit{Dictaminum radii} in 1087. The term was not unique to the \textit{ars dictaminis}, however, and was also used in treatises on prayer and meditation. Modern takes on the \textit{captatio benevolentiae} vary from the assumption that it is mere flattery to equation with the \textit{exordium} as a whole … The \textit{captatio benevolentiae}, then, is a label which is rarely provided a concrete definition outside of epistolary handbooks; it is a term often thrown about dismissively in modern rhetorical scholarship to denote mere flattery of the audience. I believe that Apuleius’ \textit{captationes benevolentiae}, like the \textit{exordia} in which they are found, are not merely empty formulae, but rather serve to further define his relationship with his audience by involving them in an intratextual dialogue within his own speech and also in intertextual dialogues with other pertinent works.”


\textsuperscript{16} Mullins, “Formulas,” 387. Like Schubert, he thought that a strict and narrow definition of epistolary forms would mitigate overvaluing ancient epistolary categories and emphasise the human character of NT language.
each author. Nevertheless, our study of these letters has uncovered a repertoire of components that can be systematized to a certain extent.\textsuperscript{17}

The problem is the presupposition that ancient epistolary-rhetorical categories exercised a normative constraint external to human volition so that, \textit{ipso facto}, Paul’s letters are deviations.\textsuperscript{18} In 1974, Klaus Berger identified why all systematic applications of ancient epistolary-rhetorical categories ultimately fail, regardless of mitigation: there is never an explanation as to why Paul deviated.\textsuperscript{19} In 2010, select essays published from the SNTS seminar “Paul and Rhetoric” (active from 2002 to 2008) confirm Berger’s observation by concluding that a strict application of ancient epistolographic and rhetorical categories to the undisputed Pauline corpus has ended in an impasse.\textsuperscript{20} Overall, three reasons contributed to the conclusion: 1) The clarity, distinctiveness, and actual use of the categories in the ancient world has been overestimated; 2) All Paul’s letters could be classified as \textit{deliberative}; 3) Exegesis that overestimates the public-address motif can produce anachronistic conclusions.\textsuperscript{21} However, the seminar also maintained that the historic study of ancient epistolography and rhetoric should not be abandoned, but conditioned by beginning with Paul’s rhetoric.\textsuperscript{22} The following sub-sections show that an embodied hermeneutic can succeed because it is a diachronic approach that incorporates


\textsuperscript{18} e.g. Sean A. Adams, “Paul’s Letter Opening and Greek Epistolography,” in \textit{Ancient Letter Form}, 49, 55, “With all of these examples [Greek-Roman epistolary health wishes], it is surprising that Paul did not incorporate any one of these formulas into his letters ... Overall, it is important to evaluate Paul’s letter openings, and indeed his entire letter, in light of Greek epistolary traditions in order to determine Paul’s deviations from the normal practice. Once these changes are identified, their significance for interpretation and the framing of the remainder of the letter can be evaluated.” Murray J. Harris, \textit{The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text}, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 937, “Instead of concluding [2 Corinthians] with a generalized wish such as is found in contemporary letters (e.g. ἔρρωσθαι ὑμᾶς εὔχομαι, "I pray you may fare well"), Paul closes with a benediction in the form of a wish.”


culturally specific rhetorical systems as ontogenetic instantiations of prototypical human cognition.23

A) Categorical Analysis: From Prescriptive Typology to Descriptive Topology

Using an embodied hermeneutic to replace the presupposition that Paul’s letters are deviations from customary Graeco-Roman practice requires a modification of Philip Kern’s call to sever the link between the Pauline epistles and classical oratory so that scholars can “replace attempts to uncover classical rhetoric with efforts to describe early Christian rhetoric and, ultimately, Paul’s rhetoric,” and adopting Abraham Malherbe’s assessment of the relationship between the handbooks and actual epistolary practice.24

Malherbe noted that while epistolary style was a concern for the rhetoricians, it is difficult to determine at what stage letter writing was introduced in classical education, and it appears only to have gradually attached itself to their rhetorical systems.”25 His summary is noteworthy because it reflects the principles of language as a complex adaptive system in which the process and result simultaneously develop higher levels of complexity.

One should not expect an unrealistic agreement in detail between the handbooks and letters. They did not intend to set forth detailed norms or forms, but presented a framework which allowed for individual creativity. The handbooks on various levels reflect the traditional and typical elements of letter style, and are therefore valuable as preservers of those traditions, but it would be a mistake to limit their role to reflecting practice and deny that they might also have influenced it. It seems more reasonable that the directions contained in the handbooks were derived from actual practice which was in turn influenced by the manuals through their use in the schools.26

Because ancient epistolary-rhetorical practices were an amalgam of entrained form and emergent function at the interface of an individual’s embodiment, an accurate description of Paul’s rhetoric requires severing the conclusion that a pattern, no matter how well-established or long-attested, is not what must have happened, but only evidence of what did happen. Kern correctly expresses the fact that epistolary-rhetorical categories have no

23 A repeated concern was that studies which use general communication theory tend to be synchronic epistemological approaches which are devoid of objective reality and the hope of attaining it. e.g. Lampe, “Rhetorical Analysis,” 21; Troy Martin, “Invention and Arrangement in Pauline Rhetorical Studies,” 49.


25 Malherbe, Theorists, 6–7.

26 Malherbe, Theorists, 5.
typological value (meaning by category) for Pauline interpretation. However, epistolary-rhetorical analysis is necessary to establish linguistic topological value (meaning by degree) via a descriptive heuristic. The issue, described in more detail as the study progresses, is that there are always linguistic procedural markers which constitute a scale of authorial emotion and self-involvement that cannot be understood in terms of form and type. To illustrate this point, the next section applies an embodied hermeneutic to a Graeco-Roman letter which is thought to have little significance for classical categorical analysis.

B) Embodied Hermeneutics and CPR 5.19

Stanley Stowers says CPR 5.19 illustrates a fundamentally hierarchical Graeco-Roman society structured by the patron-client relationship because the author, “does nothing except give honor to his patron.” Horsley writes, “This letter entirely lacks circumstantial content. So taken up is it with fulsome greeting of the addressee and his family and with prayers for their good health that one may even wonder what gave rise to it at all.” The following analysis shows why Horsley’s overvaluation of form and Stowers’ overvaluation of type obscure how the letter communicated living meaning between real persons. It reads:

1 Ἑφμ. [- ca.15 -], [. . . ]
   καὶ ἐ[ ca.13 -] χαίρειν καὶ διὰ πάντων ἔρωμα]ένον διαμένειν ἐλω [τύ] σώματι
5 ἵνα τὸν ἔρωμα]άν πάντως ἐπετρέψει ἡμῖν ἵνα σε προσκυνήσωμεν καὶ ἁσπα-
   σώμεθα σε. ὡς καὶ σὺ γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐμνήσθης παρ’ ἐκαστά κατ’ ἐπισ-
10 τὸλήν, οὕτως καγὼ ἐνβίαδε
tὸ προσκύνημα]ά σου ποιῶ παρὰ

27 NewDocs, 1:18. Several steles commemorating the Isis cult reveal a “creedal element … reflecting the essential belief of a popular religious movement, not merely that of diverse individuals.”

28 Stowers, Letter Writing, 28.

29 NewDocs, 1:57.
Although πάτρων (line 18) does imply a patron-client relationship, the compound τροφεύς (lines 18–19) may have had an emotional currency which suggests a relationship between the writer and recipient that exceeded patronage and engendered genuine intimacy. It appears in Jacob’s blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, ὁ θεὸς ὁ τρέφων με ἐκ νεότητος ἐως τῆς ημέρας ταύτης (Gen 48:15), which Philo interpreted as a beautiful sign that Jacob considered God his τροφεύς instead of the blessing (Leg. 3:177). Philo also included τροφεύς in a list of divine attributes (Congr. 171) and described Moses as the τροφεύς of good character (Migr. 24). Polybius put the cognate τρόφος on the lips of Demetrius in his impassioned plea before the Roman Senate (Hist. 31.2.5). Paul used it to describe his relationship with the Thessalonians—ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα (1 Thess 2:7).

Also, note that the writer reported performing prayers before multiple deities—The Sons of Zeus and Serapis. The adverb ἐνθάδε (line 10) could denote the writer’s geographical separation from the recipient. Or, it could potentially denote entering two separate temples. Polybius describes a temple dedicated to Zeus and a temple dedicated to Serapis located within a mile and a half of one another in the city of Byzantium (Hist. 4.39). Whatever the extent of the performance, the intentionality it required was a significant experience for the writer.

The final consideration in this brief analysis is the remark ὡς καὶ σὺ γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐμνήσθης παρ’ ἐκάστα κατ’ ἐπιστολὴν (lines 8–10) Obviously, the comment signifies that the writer’s prayers are a response in kind to the prayers of the recipient. The concern here is not to

---

30 Letter dated 1–199 AD. DDbDP. http://papyri.info/ddbdp/cpr;5;19. (underscoring added)
argue against a generic RECIPROCITY schema, but to argue that the reciprocating prayers and the first-hand reporting of those performances represent a teleological reciprocity rather than a mechanical reciprocity which is only employed to maintain an impersonal categorical status. This letter represents teleological reciprocity because the act of prayer in abstenia was circumstance enough to warrant a letter. The point is not that prayer was mechanically essential to maintaining the patron-client relationship, but that there was a dimension to the relationship which could only be expressed by prayer and prayer reports.

Examined in this way, CPR 5.19 offers evidence that the function of letter-writing extended beyond communicating information and petitioning requests, and that prayer language was a unifying force within the communicative conscience of the ancient worldview. Given the constant threat of war, famine, sickness, and economic instability which characterized ancient life, it is understandable that health and good fortune were at the forefront of prayer. The gods were the primary hope for combatting these uncontrollable and unpredictable aspects of life. Thus, the circumstance that gave rise to CPR 5.19 was the active life of the author which was prototypically activated by prayer. Form and type are constrained by the medium, the limits of available vocabulary, and cultural convention. However, these are phenomenally emergent constraints, not illocutionary controls.

This is further illustrated by the phrase πρὸ μὲν πάντων, which occurs in over 250 papyri from the first century onward, and was primarily used to introduce the prayers of the writer for the recipient. The prayer reports range in complexity from εὐχομαί σε υγίειν to πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί [σ]ε υγίειν καὶ τὸ προσκύνημα σου ποιῶ [καὶ] ἐπιστολίδιον (BGU 3.845). At least one letter used the phrase to admonish the recipient: πρῶτον μὲν [γε]ινώσκιν σαι θέλω, ὅτει λυποῦμαι, ὅπό[τ]ιν τις παραγένηται καὶ μη ἐνέγ[κ]ὴ μοι ἐπιστολίδιον (BGU 3.845).

31 See discussion of reciprocity in 8.1.
32 According to an electronic search of papyri.info.
33 Cf. P.Fay. 127 and P.Genova 1.49
34 Cf. P.Mich. 8.475
The temptation to label this pattern a *conditio sine qua non* of letter writing is offset by other letters which follow *πρὸ μὲν πάντων* with words like *ἀσπάζομαι*, *προσαγορεύω*, or a collocation of *εὔχομαι* and *ἀσπάζομαι* which emphasize the writer’s emotional commitment to the social practice of letter writing. If *πρὸ μὲν πάντων* was a customary introductory formula, it is best understood as a procedural marker for increasing the emotive scale (and so the hermeneutic value) of what follows. Generally, people do not write statements such as *πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὔχομαι τῇ θείᾳ προνοίᾳ ὅπως ἀπολάβῃς τὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ γράμματα* (P.XV.Congr. 20) as a flippant or mechanically obligatory remark.

4.3) Bridging the Epistolary-Rhetorical Impasse

The epistolary-rhetorical hermeneutic impasse really begins with the fact that the transformation of Christianity from a Jewish sect to the predominant religion of the Graeco-Roman world is a phenomenon in human history. As Larry Hurtado says, “We cannot appreciate early Christian worship unless we keep before our eyes the fact that for Gentile Christians it represented a *replacement cultus*.” A replacement cultus is not a mere replacement of ritual, but a replacement of identity which would require a radical cognitive shift. On this point, James Rives is correct, “The expansion of Christianity is historically significant precisely because it represents something more than a new deity acquiring increasing numbers of adherents: it represents the growth of a new social and conceptual system, a new ideology of religion.”

Such a drastic cognitive and practical disruption requires some differentiation, despite the fact that Paul’s prayer language was neither linguistically novel, nor conceptually superior to that of any Gentile. Otherwise, ancient prayer was no more than a perfunctory ritual

---

35 O.Douch 1.2, 3.290, 5.637; O.Berenike. 2.129; BGU 3.824; O.Did 403; P.Freib. 4.57; P.Giss.Apoll. 14; O.Buch. 108. All the letters reviewed for this project which state the need to greet the recipient above all else contain *χαίρειν* in the prescript.

36 See chapter seven below.

37 Interestingly, Christian letters reflect a similar verbiage: *πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχόμαι τὴν υἱγύαν ὑμῶν παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ* (P.Köln 2.109); *πρὸ μὲν πάντων πολλὰ προσκυνῶ τῆς σὺ ἀδελφωτίκου κυρίῳ* followed by a cross (P.Harr. 1.154); and *πρὸ μὲν πάντων* followed by a chi-rho (C.Illum.Pap. 34). Potentially P.Col. 10.290: *πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχαριστῶ τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τῆς ύμῶν.*

38 F.F. Bruce says that it would still be surprising were it not so familiar, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 17–18.


which signified piety simply by performance. Any formative significance would be relegated to the subjective conscience of the practitioner, and the study of Pauline prayer language could be confined to form criticism and sociolinguistic dependency. Ultimately, such reductionist approaches caricature both Graeco-Roman religion and early Christianity, and obscure the fact that “the spread of Christianity was not an uninterrupted success story,” nor was it necessarily guaranteed in the first century context.41

This raises a question which Lampe says, “[Regardless of one’s] position … is legitimate: Does a genuinely early Christian rhetoric begin to emerge already in New Testament times?”42 The next section addresses this question regarding the phrase χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη because it has been the subject of numerous epistolary-rhetorical theories.

A) Does χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη signify a genuine Christian rhetoric?

On the one hand, Murphy-O’Connor is correct that an intentional effort to accommodate early Christian theology to ancient letter writing style is a “romantic notion.”43 In relation to extant ancient letters, the idea that χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη was an intentional combination of the traditional Hebrew greeting שָׁלוֹם and a theologically modified form of the Greek greeting χαίρειν has two evidentiary problems.44 First, a true innovation would require more standardization than is evident for non-Christian greeting prayers. Francis Exler shows that though the most common order was “A to B greeting,” there are numerous examples of “B to A minus a greeting.”45 He cites a dozen variant openings current during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods in which “the ἔρρωσθαι wish joined with the opening formula, thus forming the phrase: A to B—χαίρειν καὶ ἔρρωσθαι.”46 The temptation to consider this combination an ontogenetic development is averted, Exler points out,

41 Everett Ferguson, Backgrounds of Early Christianity, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 608, see 608–620 for full discussion.
46 Exler, Ancient Greek Letter, 60–61, 106.
because the combination χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν predates the separate use of these two particular terms. 47

Second, if the greeting was an overt Christian replacement of the Greek greeting, then some explanation is necessary for James 1:1 (A to B χαίρειν) and the use of the typical Graeco-Roman health wish, εὖχομαι σε εὖδοσθαι καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, in 3 John. Are these letters more Hellenized, less Christian, or representative of competing Christian theologies; or, were these writers less Christian, or less concerned with ‘technical’ vocabulary? 48 Unless it can be shown that χαίρειν, εὖδοσθαι, or ὑγιαίνειν evoke a substantially different conception of the Christ-narrative than χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, the answer is negative. Similarly, the claim that Paul coined the phrase is beset by its appearance in the Apocalypse and the Petrine letters. 49

Despite the necessity to reject the idea that the phrase was an intentional early Christian innovation, it is worth considering the potential that the same cognitive operations which elicited the romantic hermeneutic were part of the unconscious cognitive processes which contributed to the emergence of the phrase. It should be recognised that this interpretive romanticism arose easily as a cognitive blend based upon: 1) the accepted prototypical idea of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah who was also sent to the Gentiles, and 2) the readily observable patterns that χαίρειν and χάρις are derived from the same root, and 3) that the LXX frequently used εἰρήνη to translate שָׁלוֹם.

In other words, while χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη cannot be considered a Christian or Pauline innovation, it was meant to communicate something that can be properly defined as semantically Christian. 50 However, the next section shows that it is much easier to interpret the phrase as an element of the higher complexity which stabilized emergent

48 e.g. Scott McKnight, “The use of the cognate for “grace” reflects customary rather than early Christian, especially Pauline, theology,” The Letter of James, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 68. Patrick Hartin, “This is in contrast to the Jewish greeting of ‘peace’ … James formality and conformity to the Hellenistic format contrasts sharply with other New Testament letters,” James, SP 14 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 51. Martin Dibelius, “[O]ne who makes the common epistolary greeting an integral part of the letter is restoring to the greeting the significance which the formulary usage had taken away from it,” A Commentary on the Epistle of James, trans. Heinrich Greeven, Hermencia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 68.
Christianity as an independent complex adaptive system rather than the product of a mechanical process.

B) The emergent complexity of χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη

Whatever judgment one may make of his conclusions, David Trobisch is correct to say that Paul’s letter collection, and the letters themselves, did not originate “in a very spectacular way.” 51 The written correspondence between Paul and his audiences was part of the historic setting of his mission which also included preaching, debating, travelling, going to jail, being stoned, and escaping out a window. However, Tite is also on the right track to suggest that χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη belongs to a blessing motif within emergent Christianity. 52 Additionally, Moule’s insight that, “Distinctively Christian worship bears the same sort of relation to Jewish worship as the distinctively Christian writings do to the Jewish scriptures,” deserves due attention. 53 The problem is determining the relationship between distinctively Christian worship and the distinctively Christian writings; in this case, Paul’s letters.

Similar to the argument that the phrase was an intentional combination of Greek and Jewish greetings, suggestions that Paul’s language was either determined by, or even drawn from, early Christian worship must be appropriated with great care in order to avoid necessitating linear causality. For example, John Paul Heil begins his defence of Paul’s letters as “rituals of worship” with the assumption that “the original setting for the public performance of these letters was communal worship that was most likely connected to the celebration of the Eucharist.” 54 The dispute does not concern claims that the letters contain cultic language and constitute Paul’s own worship. In fact, Heil’s general conclusion is not far removed from this study: “When his audiences hear Paul praising and glorifying God in his letters, they are drawn into his own worship, inspired to imitate him as the preeminent and paradigmatic person of prayer.” 55 However, it does not follow from this that the letters were intended as pro forma liturgies for communal worship. 56 What seems

52 Tite, “How to Begin,” 73.
56 See Harry Gamble, The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism, SD 42 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 143 n. 2, for the observation concerning the lack of
to go unnoticed by those who argue for this conclusion is the entrainment created by the fact that this is the way in which Paul’s letters have been experienced by those attending Christian worship for nearly two millennia. Even so, the persistence of this argument is, again, evidence that the prototypical associations involved are valid, and could yield a more reasonable, though not unrelated, description.\footnote{Even citing Gamble’s dissention, Wiles declared, “it is now generally agreed that the reading of the apostolic letters was itself an important component of the semi-public worship, perhaps followed immediately by the eucharist,” Prayers, 10. The argument is most commonly attributed to Oscar Cullmann, \textit{Early Christian Worship}, trans. A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance, SBT 10 (London: SCM Press, 1954), 23–25. Its tenacity may reflect the continued publication and wide use of Cullman’s work (WorldCat lists 38 editions, the latest in 1987). Note, Denis Farkasfalvy, “The Eucharistic Provenance of New Testament Texts,” in Rediscovering the Eucharist: Ecumenical Conversations, ed. Roch A. Kereszty (New York: Paulist, 2003), 28, “the presence of liturgical formulas (greeting, prayers, blessings, fragments of hymns) are unmistakable signs that they were meant to be presented to communities at assemblies connected with the celebration of the Eucharist.”}

For example, Klaus Berger proposes that the phrase emerged in apostolic preaching due to the combination of ἔλεος and εἰρήνη in the OT, and the synonymy between χάρις and ἔλεος in the Wisdom Literature.\footnote{Berger, “Apostelbrief,” 191–199.} The significance of Berger’s proposal is not in the details, but in the idea that the phrase phenomenally emerged from apostolic preaching. This accommodates three critical points: 1) Despite Paul’s individual significance, he was one part of an emerging complex system that was self-organising around the same historically contingent event; 2) Individual parts of complex adaptive systems move towards synchronicity in proportion to similar tasks; 3) Such synchronicity \textit{can} manifest the linguistic structure known as \textit{collocation}—a multi-word unit “formed on the basis of the habitual co-occurrence of lexical items.”\footnote{Susanne Handl and Eva-Maria Graf, “Collocation, anchoring, and the mental lexicon—an ontogenetic perspective,” in \textit{Cognitive Foundations of Linguistic Usage Patterns}, ed. Hans-Jörg Schmid and Susanne Handl, ACL 13: (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 119.} According to Susanne Handl and Eva-Maria Graf, collocations are not random, but intentional constructs formed from “the insight that each [lexical] element makes a separate contribution to the overall meaning and function of the utterance.”\footnote{Handl and Graf, “Collocation,” 126. Furthermore, collocations are integral for language acquisition because such semantic units reduce cognitive processing effort and effect, what they label, a “native-like” communicative competence, 119.} Although it is beyond the scope of this study, the details of Berger’s proposal merit consideration because Paul was not the only person connecting the Christ-narrative to the historic

\footnote{\textit{Prayers}, 10. The argument is most commonly attributed to Oscar Cullmann, \textit{Early Christian Worship}, trans. A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance, SBT 10 (London: SCM Press, 1954), 23–25. Its tenacity may reflect the continued publication and wide use of Cullman’s work (WorldCat lists 38 editions, the latest in 1987). Note, Denis Farkasfalvy, “The Eucharistic Provenance of New Testament Texts,” in Rediscovering the Eucharist: Ecumenical Conversations, ed. Roch A. Kereszty (New York: Paulist, 2003), 28, “the presence of liturgical formulas (greeting, prayers, blessings, fragments of hymns) are unmistakable signs that they were meant to be presented to communities at assemblies connected with the celebration of the Eucharist.”}
narrative, and the OT injunctions for individuals to talk about God’s work and provision in every aspect of daily life (Deut 6:6–9, 11:18–21) so that posterity may remain faithful (Deut 4:9, 6:2, 11:21; Ps 77:5–7 LXX) and the assembly motif for retelling the story in Num 6:22–27 suggest that a self-regulating blessing leitmotiv was entrenched in 2T Judaism.61 Even if it is not possible to determine why χάρις and εἰρήνη became collocated, Berger’s proposal makes it reasonable to assume Paul intentionally used the blessing as a pedagogical tool for communicating his message and training others in effective Christian dialogue.62

4.4) Conclusion

This chapter has laid the foundation for the continued argument that Paul’s integrative use of prayer language rendered epistolary-rhetorical criticism of Paul’s prayer language typologically invalid but topologically necessary. The analysis showed that ancient epistolary practice emerged from the generic human capacity and need for interpersonal communication within the constraints of a particular historic environment. The seminal point is that any global constraints exerted by ancient practices did not, in any context, constitute an “externally imposed control mechanism.”63 Therefore, Paul’s epistolary practice, including employing prayer language, reflected the available technology and a generic worldview in which a prototypical ‘liturgy’ of prayer was an essential element of personal identity and interpersonal communication. His opening and closing epistolary prayers are best understood as entrenched cognitive networks of significant interpersonal emotion which emerged from a prayer-structured worldview, instead of obligatory epistolary elements. Furthermore, the critical point of beginning for understanding Paul’s use of epistolary prayer is not to establish linguistic dependency or reconstruct the initial setting for the first public performance of his letters, but to view his letters and the prayers they contain as significant historic events that defined emergent Christianity as an independent complex religious adaptive system. As

---

61 The Numbers blessing is frequent in prayers concerning the face of God (Pss 12:2, 26:8–9, 29:8, 30:17, 43:25, 44:13, 49:21, 50:11, 68:18, 87:15, 101:3, 118:35, 142:7 LXX). The positive view is epitomized by the refrain of Ps 79 LXX (vv. 4,8,20): ὁ θεός, ἐπίστρεψον ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ σωθῆσομεθα. The negative aspect is summarized by Is 59:2 LXX, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα ὑμῶν διιστῶσιν ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν ἀπέστρεψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀφ’ ὑμῶν τοῦ μὴ ἔλεησαι (cf. Is 64:6 LXX).

62 See Robbins, Christian Discourse, for an articulation of the concept of a specifically Christian dialogue.

63 Juarrero, Dynamics, 116.
Klauck’s observed, “the specific characteristic of Christianity in many cases is to be found less in the details and the individual aspects than in the total pattern and in the unifying centre-point, which gives structure to the Christian universe of meaning.”

---

Chapter four showed the synchronicity between Paul’s prayer language and that of his Gentile audiences was a natural function of a common worldview that was partially structured by prayer. However, because Paul’s prayer language achieved human scale in synch with emerging Christianity, the distinction between Pauline and Graeco-Roman prayer was not linguistic typology, but a semantic topology which emerged from the total structure of the Christian worldview. This chapter introduces a position which integrates Ostmeyer’s view of blurring, Harder’s concept that Christian prayer was formed by Jewish prayer, and Hamman’s view of continuity and sharp division—Paul’s missional use of prayer emerged from a common 2T Jewish prayer-based hermeneutic, and yet manifested a complex adaptive semantic topology that was distinctly Christian.¹

In 1995, Christopher Rowland wrote, “The Jewish origins of Christianity are now doubted by few historians. Where there is wide divergence is where (and when) Christianity left behind its Jewish milieu and became a socio-religious system (substantially) different from the parent religion.”² Now, the divergence has widened to include, “Did Christianity separate from Judaism?”³

As in chapter four, the first section describes 2T Judaism as a complex adaptive religious system. The second section proposes that the common 2T Jewish hermeneutic involved the conceptual blend Living in the Torah. The third section illustrates the significance of prayer as the blended space for covenant remembrance and participation in this hermeneutic. The fourth section distinguishes between Jewish and Graeco-Roman Prayer.

¹ Cf. Barclay, The Gift, 338, “Paul’s letter to the Galatians thus remaps reality with a cartography capable of blurring traditional categories by means of newly minted distinctions.20 These polarities take their bearings from the Christ-event: general terms such as “freedom,” “Spirit,” and “grace” (even “God”) are here related to a Christological referent. The challenge for interpreters lies in the fact that these varied polarities are not always connected and do not self-evidently resolve into a single macro-contrast.”


The concluding section sketches the topology of Paul’s prayer language which is detailed in Part III.

5.1) The Sensorimotor Constraints of 2T Judaism as a Complex Adaptive Religious System

Despite the diverse manifestations of Judaism in the 2TP, John Collins says there was a “common thread of Jewish identity” that relied on a common tradition, “in whatever form:”

The author of 3 Baruch still uses the pseudonym of a Hebrew prophet. Artapanus may pay scant attention to Deuteronomistic law, but he is determined to glorify the ancestors of the Jews. Philo’s philosophy may be basically derived from Greek tradition, but he expresses it through exegesis of the Jewish Torah. Even Pseudo-Phocylides, who makes no explicit references to Judaism, betrays his identity by his use of the Septuagint. This common reliance on the tradition, rather than any specific interpretation of it, is what enables us to distinguish Jew from Gentile in the Hellenistic Diaspora.4

Because complex adaptive systems theory says that a common tradition has identifiable historic elements which create a prototypical narrative for the self-organisation and self-regulation of all variants, this section briefly presents scholarly evidence that the common thread of 2T Jewish identity entailed four sensorimotor constraints: The city of Jerusalem, the Jerusalem Temple, the Synagogue, and the Torah.5 Lee Levine says the Romans equated the Torah with a statue of a god, and that Jerusalem’s “dual orientation” as the geographic centre of the historic Jewish covenant faith and the paragon of a Roman cosmopolitan city gave it a “Janus-type posture” which distinguished it “within Jewish

---


5 Complex adaptive systems theory is able to reject the Hegelian Dialectic as the necessary progression of cultural development without denying the existence of genuine conflict.
society and vis-à-vis the larger Roman world.”6 Timothy Wardle thinks that the magnificence of the Temple is the only explanation for the consistent respect for Jerusalem in Greek and Roman sources.7 For whatever reason, the Oniad temple in Egypt never rivalled the Jerusalem Temple.8 Diasporic pilgrimages and Temple taxes sufficiently maintained Jerusalem and its Temple.9 Dunn says such diasporic loyalty was the “raison d’être for Judea’s existence as a political entity since the Persian and Hellenistic periods,” and the defining attribute of Jewish identity in the Diaspora.10

Although the emergence of the synagogue remains shrouded in mystery and there are unanswered questions as to whether it was used to rival the Temple and Jerusalem, or to support and preserve the Temple tradition, the function of the synagogue exhibited a broadly defined unity.11 Levine even extends the concept of the synagogue to Qumran: “If indeed public worship at Qumran included hymns, prayers, and blessings, as well as a sacred communal meal, then paradoxically the ‘synagogue’ at Qumran—for all its uniqueness in setting, function, and liturgy—conforms in certain ways with the ordinary Judean synagogue.”12 The evidence appears sufficient to conclude that, despite the

---

6 Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 2002), xiv; Levine, “Jerusalem,” *EDEJ*, 789–797, here 794. Note Philo’s account of Agrippa’s appeal to Gaius: “Concerning the holy city … it … is my native country, and the metropolis, not only of the one country of Judaea, but also of many, by reason of the colonies which it has sent out from time to time … So that if my native land is … looked upon as entitled to a share in your favour, it is not one city only that would then be benefited by you, but ten thousand of them in every region of the habitable world,” *Embassy* 281–283. Cf. Ps 136:4–6 LXX: πῶς ἀσωμεν τὴν ἄδην κοινὸ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἐὰν ἑπιλαδώμαι σου, ἱερουσάλημ, ἐπιλησθείη ἡ δεξιά μου, κολληθείη ἡ γλῶσσα μου τῷ λάρυγγί μου, ἐὰν μὴ σου μνησθῶ, ἐὰν μὴ προανατάξωμαι τὴν ἱερουσάλημ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς εὐφροσύνης μου.


8 Josephus said that there was only one Temple because God was One, and the God of all humanity, *Ant.* 4.200–201, *Ag. Ap.* 2.193. Collins thinks the prevalence of Jewish ethnic solidarity across the diasporic range suggests that the Oniad temple was never meant to rival the Jerusalem Temple, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 71–72.


11 Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2000), 23, the name given to the institution (proseuche, hieron, hagias topos, eucheion, sabbateion, didaskeleion, bet ‘am, amphitheatre, and temple), “depended on local needs and self-perceptions.” Catherine Hezser says that none of the various names and functions of the synagogue can be described as secular, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, TSAJ 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 452, n. 10.

Hellenistic Diaspora and intra-Jewish dissent, Jerusalem, the Temple, and the synagogue presented an integrated singular ontology, especially in comparison to the multiplicity of non-Jewish temples and cults.\textsuperscript{13}

Despite the variety of text types, the 2TP evidenced a broadly defined consistent textual and hermeneutic topology. For example, Dwight Swanson concludes that the Qumran ‘library’ cannot be relegated to “extremist sect living on the edges of normative Judaism, having little to contribute to the outside world,” because “the literature found at Qumran can be seen to be a part of the whole of the Judaism of its day.”\textsuperscript{14} In parallel terms to complex adaptive systems theory, David Lincicum describes the authoritative \textit{Wirkungsgeschichte} of Deuteronomy throughout the 2TP as a function of the broadly defined consistency of its content and the common interpretation of the text as self-evidently authoritative. He says, “[The text] prepares the hermeneutical space which it subsequently comes to inhabit.”\textsuperscript{15} The following section extends this idea to the return from exile under Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh 8–10), which Levine and Hindy Najman identify as the paradigm shift of the interpreter usurping the prophet as the mediator of God’s word.\textsuperscript{16}

5.2) Living in The Torah: A Hermeneutic of Conceptual Blending

Najman says the presence of the interpreters at the public reading of the Torah signifies two transformations in the prototypical ontic expression of Judaic ontology: 1) “The authority of the interpreter, unlike that of the prophet, depended upon the authenticity of the text as Mosaic;” 2) The coordination of public reading and interpretation constituted a re-presentation of the text that was conceived as a re-living of the text.\textsuperscript{17} Thereafter, “The status of Torah is ascribed, not to specific laws or bodies of law, but to authoritative

\textsuperscript{13} Levine, \textit{Portrait}, xvii, “In contrast to other cults and peoples who had many temples, the Jews had only one, inextricably bound to Jerusalem, which guaranteed the city’s religious pre-eminence.”


\textsuperscript{15} David Lincicum, \textit{Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy}, WUNT 2/284 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 62.

\textsuperscript{16} Levine, \textit{Portrait}, 30, though he questions whether the Torah reading of Nehemiah 8–10 signals the beginning of the synagogue, or if it was a one-time special occasion which made the later Torah reading ceremony of the synagogue an institutional result rather than a cause, \textit{Ancient Synagogue}, 23. Hindy Najman, \textit{Seconding Sinai: The Developing of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism}, JSJS 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 36. For the return under Ezra-Nehemiah as the beginning of the 2TP see, Samuel Balentine, \textit{The Torah's Vision of Worship}, OBT (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999); Jacob Neusner, \textit{The Emergence of Judaism} (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 4–6; and Levine, \textit{Portrait}, 20–44.

\textsuperscript{17} Najman, \textit{Seconding Sinai}, 30–31.
tradition as a whole, including laws of many kinds, as well as narratives—thus to a whole whose unity can only be indicated as that which is present to the reader.”18 George Brooke says the same for the Qumran community:

The overriding character of the religious self-expression of those who lived at Qumran and of the Judaism of which they were a part was their concern with tradition. Attitudes to the Law were certainly a part of that concern, but it was much broader than the Law alone. The majority of compositions from the Qumran caves are concerned one way or another with the transmission of scriptural traditions. The dominant issue is the transmission and interpretation of authoritative Scriptures.19

Whether in the Jerusalem Temple, the diasporic or Palestinian synagogue, or a community such as Qumran, Torah-reading and interpretation prepared the expressive singularity which Judaism came to inhabit—the unmitigated continuance of the divine covenant narrative. As Wright says, “The main point about narratives in the Second-Temple Jewish world, and in that of Paul, is not simply that people liked telling stories as illustrations of, or scriptural proofs for, this or that experience or doctrine, but rather that Second Temple Jews believed themselves to be actors within a real-life narrative.”20 This concept was not understood as being imposed upon the text, but as arising from it, and “flowed, above all, through two channels: ritual and recital.”21 Based on Eep Talstra’s two-part characterization of biblical prayer, the next section examines prayer as an essential blended space for living in the covenant narrative.

1. The art of praying is neither something ritual, nor an individual meditation. Rather it is communication, based on a long tradition of texts about God, his people and their common history. Communication allows for many genres: complaint, confession, and even exclamations such as: ‘please remember’.

2. Biblical prayer with its emphasis on common history, using all existing genres of communication is intertextual by definition. This art of praying is impossible without traditional textual material to be reused for actual praying.22

18 Najman, Seconding Sinai, 32.

19 George J. Brooke, The Dead Sea Scrolls and The New Testament (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), xvii. Levine, Ancient Synagogue, 65, surmises that the possible raised platform in the western end of room 77 at Qumran could indicate a “re-presentation” of Nehemiah 8:4–5.

20 N.T. Wright, Paul: In Fresh Perspective (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 11.

21 Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory, SASLJS (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), 11.

Prayer as The Blended Space for Covenant Remembrance and Participation

Yosef Yerushalmi counts one hundred and sixty-nine various declensions of זכר in the Hebrew Bible, “usually with either Israel or God as its subject for memory is incumbent upon both,” signifying that the Torah’s “intuitive and revolutionary” idea that human history revealed the will and purpose of God: “When they evoke the past, it is not the primeval but the historical past, in which the great and critical moments of Israel’s history were fulfilled.”

In Deuteronomy, the ubiquity of remembrance language has been called a “theology of remembrance.” Following Lincicum, this section explores the Nachleben (afterlife) of biblical prayer in the 2TP. Select evidence suggests that 2T Jewish prayer emerged as an embodied hermeneutic of covenant remembrance and participation. In part, the Nachleben of biblical prayer manifested as a mnemonic narrative of obedience and differentiation that compressed immediate circumstances with the historic record. A mnemonic is a memory device designed to allow someone to access a large data set through a creatively connective summary. A mnemonic narrative does not have to be a summary, per se, of a larger narrative. It must only contain the “prototypical semantic core” of the larger narrative, which can occur in a variety of ways.

Such a prototype merges information from one or more exemplary examples, instantiating (parts of) an (idealized) property configuration that … trigger the selection of a structure when the properties are explicitly present in the context and are invoked implicitly through the selection of the structure when the properties are

---

23 Yerushalmi, Zakhor, 9; 5, Emphasis mine. (e.g. Genesis 32:7 epitomizes Israel’s responsibility. Jeremiah 31:20 and Ezekiel 16:59–60 extol God’s mercy in remembering). Also, Norman B. Johnson, “The inducement which the Jews employed most regularly in their prayers was a reminder of God's past promises … [which involved] the appeal to precedent in God's past relations with his people,” Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Study of the Jewish Concept of God, SBLMS 2 (Philadelphia: Scholars Press, 1948), 46, 47.


25 Lincicum, Paul and Deuteronomy, 63. Apparently, Nachleben satisfies his concern that “the characteristically German concern for history (Wirkungsgeschichte) must supplement and correct the French fascination with theory (l’intertextualité),” 11.

26 The term mnemonic narrative is meant to capture Jeffrey Olick’s concept that, “genuine communities are communities of memory that constantly tell and retell their constitutive memories,” Quoted in Alan Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” in Memory, Tradition and Text: Use of the Past in Early Christianity, ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher, SemeiaSt 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 4. The idea of prayer as a mnemonic narrative is similar to Judith H. Newman, Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism, EJL 14 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 53, “A crucial step in the trajectory of scripturalization occurs when the prayer recalls not just an event from the individual pray-er’s life experience, but remembers an event from the corporate life of Israel, from the traditional history of the people. Corporate memory separates the remembered past of a people from the lived past of an individual.”
A) The Nachleben of Prayer in the Qumran Community

According to Leslie Allen, in CD 1:4 and 6:2, זכר indicates a communal self-identity of the remembered community recorded in Leviticus 26:45. The understanding that covenant remembrance in the context of prayer was evidence of covenant faithfulness is suggested by 1QM 18:6–8: The faithful “shall begin speaking and say: Blessed be your name, God of gods, for you have magnified yourself with your nation in order to work wonders. From of old you have kept for us your covenant.” The use of historic narrative for corporate worship is described in 1QS 1:21–22: “The priests shall recite the just deeds of God in his mighty works, and they shall proclaim all his merciful favours towards Israel.” The required prayer rejoinder is given in 1QS 2:18: “[A]ll those who enter the covenant shall respond and shall say after them: « Amen, Amen ».” The immediate context distinguishes between the obedient and the disobedient to define covenant participants. Outsiders had “treated revealed matters with disrespect; this is why wrath will rise up for judgment in order to effect revenge by the curses of the covenant” (1QS 5:12). Therefore, the remembrance prayer of covenant obedience entailed remembering the deeds of the disobedient: “With hymns shall I open my mouth and my tongue will continually recount both the just acts of God and the unfaithfulness of men until their iniquity is complete” (1QS 10:23).

B) The Nachleben of Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

A brief analysis of the Addition to Esther, Judith 9, and Tobit shows that Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal prayers were not spontaneous, but carefully crafted documents which imitated earlier prayers and were intentionally designed to be imitated by future


29 Potentially due to the cosmic application of the Law. Cf. 1QS 3:13–15, “The Instructor should instruct and teach all the sons of light about the nature of all the sons of man, concerning all the ranks of their spirits, in accordance with their signs, concerning their deeds in their generations, and concerning the visitation of their punishments and the times of their reward. From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be. Before they existed he established their entire design.”

generations. Since the LXX consistently translates זכר with the μνημονεύω/μνημόσυνον word group which connotes “remember, recall, call to mind, usually as affecting present feeling, thought, or action,” the analysis focuses on how remembrance language compresses the narratives with the historic narrative to re-create the paradigmatic prayer in the biblical Hebraic narrative as a vehicle to transmit theological and sociological ideals.

In the story of Esther, Mordecai’s obedience echoes Noah’s. The Greek Addition C begins with Mordecai praying—ἐδεήθη κυρίου μνημονεύων πάντα τὰ ἔργα κυρίου (Add Esth 4:17a). For reasons explained in chapter six, μνημονεύων is best construed as a circumstantial adverbial participle of means, so that reciting the works of the Lord was the means by which Mordecai supplicated the Lord. The supplication includes re-presenting the current situation as a continuance of the Exodus: μὴ υπερίδῃς τὴν μερίδα σου, ἵνα σεαυτῷ ἐλυτρώσω ἀπὸ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (Add Esth 4:17g). The report that follows Mordecai’s prayer—καὶ πᾶς Ισραηλ ἐκέκραξαν ἐξ ἰσχύος αὐτῶν (Add Esth 4:17i)—makes it a corporate prayer cast in the exemplary voice of individual piety.

Similarly, Esther’s petition—μνήσθητι, κύριε, γνώσθητι ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως ἡμῶν (Add Esth 4:17r)—is a confession of faith that the current events were included in the historic record

31 The issue is not the actual historicity of past events, but that they were transmitted as historical. For a description of the understanding of history in the 2TP, see Michael E. Stone, Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha & Apocrypha: With Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition, SVTP 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 439–456.


34 Cf. Esther 4:17 and Gen 6:22 in both MT and LXX (OG). Karen H. Jobes, NETS, 424, The OG “follows the Hebrew MT more closely [than the Alpha-Text (Göttingen L)] and, when the six additional chapters are excluded, agrees with it semantically in about 87% of its translation units and formally in about 62% of its translation units.”

35 Even though υπερίδης is rightly construed as “overlook,” it is the semantic equivalent to “forget,” because εἶδον functions as the aorist of ἤρω, and εἶδος is the present perfect form of εἶδο.

because it appears between two confessions that God is their only help, which are paralleled in Pss 69:6, 108:26, 118:86, and 118:117 (LXX).37 Also like Mordecai’s prayer, Esther’s confession of sin (Add Esth 4:17n) is a corporate confession cast in the voice of an individual exemplar. The following remark δίκαιος εἶ, κύριε, combined with her prayer for remembrance, has the distinct sound of Lev 26:40–42: καὶ ἔξαγορεύσουσιν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν, ὡς παρέβησαν καὶ ὑπερεῖδόν με … καὶ μνησθόμοι καὶ μνησθόμοι Εαχωκ καὶ τῆς διαθήκης Ἰσαακ καὶ τῆς διαθήκης Αβρααμ μνησθόμοι καὶ τῆς γῆς μνησθόμοι. Bautch asserts that creation and confession of sin played a vital role in the “renovation of the Sinai covenant during the postexilic period.”38

For both Mordecai and Esther, the logical basis for the unique relationship Israel has with God stems from God’s Lordship over all creation (Add Esth 4:17b–17c, 4:17r).39 Correlatively, both describe the destruction of the Jews as the cessation of praise to God as the Lord of creation (Add Esth 4:17h, 4:17o–17p). Thus, the concept of κύριος is realized in the practical reality of βασιλεύς.40 Both prayers also parallel Hezekiah’s prayer: καὶ νῦν, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, σῶσον ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ γνώσονται πᾶσαι οἱ βασιλείαι τῆς γῆς ὅτι σὺ κύριος ὁ θεὸς μόνος (4 Kgdms 19:19). It is plausible that all three consciously restate Deut 6:4 LXX (Καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ χρίματα, ὡς ἐνετειλατο κύριος τοῖς ισραηλ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου Ἀκοῦε, Ἰσραηλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς κύριος ἡμῶν ἐς ἑστίν) which may be a conflation with Ex 20:1–3.41 Note Esther’s claim: ἐγὼ ήκουον ἐκ γενετῆς μου ἐν φυλῇ πατριᾶς μου ὅτι σὺ, κύριε, Ἐλαβες τὸν Ἰσραηλ ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ἐκ

37 For the pedagogical function of the psalter, see Steven J. L. Croft, “The cult [was] the medium for the transmission of the spiritual traditions of the people … These groups … would reshape the tradition into new prayers to be delivered in the cult by king or commoner or into new prayers to be delivered by the cultic ministers. These prayers would then be recited in the cult by the appropriate individual and so teach the congregation, indirectly, how to pray,” The Identity of the Individual in the Psalms, JSOTSup 44 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 178.

38 Richard J. Bautch, Glory and Power, Ritual and Relationship: The Sinai Covenant in the Postexilic Period, LHB 471 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 84, “The two confessions in Lev 26:40–41 lead to God’s vow not to abandon the land of Israel or its sinful people who have been sent from it into exile; prompted by confessions, God remembers the Sinai covenant as God’s final word (26:45).”

39 Note the similarity to Jesus’ declaration, καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς (Matt 28:18).

40 Markus McDowell emphasises that the Greek Esther altered the person supplicated from the king to the Lord, Prayers of Jewish Women: studies of patterns of prayer in the Second Temple period, WUNT 2/211 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 41.

41 1 Καὶ ἐδόθη κύριος πάντας τοὺς λέγους τοῦτος λέγων. 2 Ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὡς ἐξήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας. 3 οὐκ ἐσναίοι σοι θεοὶ ἐτεροί πλὴν ἡμοῖ.
πάντων τῶν προγόνων αὐτῶν εἰς κληρονομίαν αἰώνιον καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοῖς δόσα ἐλάλησας
(Add Esth 4:17m).

In Judith 9, prayer blends the story of Dinah with the current situation. The phrase ὀὐχ ὦτως ἔσται (Gen 34:7) is recast as εἴπας γάρ Οὐχ ὦτως ἔσται, καὶ ἐποίησαν (Jdt 9:2), which represented the event as divine punishment wrought on the Shechemites for violating established law. In direct address to God, Jdt 9:4 declares that the judgment was the answer to intentional prayer: ἐπεκαλέσαντό σε εἰς βοηθόν. In this case, the efficaciousness of prayer is directly proportional to its function as the medium of remembering the past works of God. The result was fourfold. The prayer was an act of holy confession that validated Judith’s faithfulness and her expectation for God to act accordingly. Therefore, the narrative function of the prayer involved encouraging the faithful among her audience and rebuking the doubters.

Analogous to this study, Newman says that “Judith’s overall appropriation of scripture represents a typological understanding of history that is not so much linear and continuous, but cyclical, manifesting recurrent patterns,” which were not “distinctive events,” but rather “the same constellation of forces” that had always been “arrayed against the Jewish people.” Judith’s prayer reflects Newman’s assessment by addressing her prayer to Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός μου Συμεών and adding the restrictive relative clause ὧ ἐδώκας ἐν χειρὶ ῥομφαίαν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἄλλογενῶν. This clause defines natives and foreigners (i.e. friends and enemies) by their knowledge of God and obedience to his law. The Shechemites are guilty because of disobedience, εἴπας γάρ Οὐχ ὦτως ἔσται, καὶ

42 Newman thinks that Judith’s prayer is modelled after Hezekiah’s because of shared elements with Isa 37:16 and 2 Kgs 19:15–19, Praying by the Book, 139. Some observations here are that the prayer is introduced by a monologue which echoes Job and Jonah (8:14), recall’s the story of the Three Hebrew boys (8:15), and recalls Exodus 20:1–3. Judith 8:25 again recalls the Hebraic story of the three boys, but could also recall the opening lines of the Prayer of Azariah (Add Dan 3:24–26) and the Song of the Three Youths (Add Dan 3:51–52). In Judith 8:27 the three Hebrew boys are replaced by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

43 Note the affinity with Ps 77:35 LXX which uses μνημονεύω instead of καλέω: καὶ ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς βοηθὸς αὐτῶν ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὑψιστὸς λυτρωτὴς αὐτῶν ἐστιν.


45 Wis 12:27–13:2 emphasises knowing the historic narrative to gain righteousness because ignorance prevents knowing the true God.
while the Assyrian guilt results from ignorance, ὁ δὲ γνωστὸν ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους (9:7). Not only does a cyclical understanding of history explain the appropriating hermeneutic of Judith’s prayer, it also maintains the continuity that prayer mitigated the guilt associated with both disobedience and ignorance.

In the story of Tobit, the efficaciousness of prayer includes angelic mediation as well as the recitation of the historic narrative and the confession of sin. Tobit, a Job-like righteous character, mistakenly accuses his wife of stealing and becomes unrighteous, despite a lifetime of faithful αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι.46 He pleads for God’s mercy in remembrance language—μνήσθητί μου καὶ ἐπίβλεψον ἐπ’ ἐμέ (Tob 3:3)—which is paralleled in Pss 24:16, 85:16, 118:132 (ἐπίβλεψον ἐπ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐλέησόν με), and Ps 68:17 (κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου ἐπίβλεψον ἐπ’ ἐμέ), and possibly echoes the Aaronic blessing. Parallel to Sir 23:1–3, Tobit confesses his unknown sin because, again, ignorance is equally as dangerous as disobedience.47 Then his prayer transitions to a confession of deliberate corporate sin for which he deserves to be punished, and he pleads for the Lord to kill him (Tob 3:4–6). Instead, Tobit loses his eyesight.

Sarah is an innocent character plagued by a demon who has killed her seven husbands prior to the consummation of the marriages and faces public scorn and the accusation of fornication. She professes her innocence and prays for mercy through death or the removal of the reproach (Tob 3:14–15).48 Tobias, son of Tobit, marries Sarah, potentially removing the reproach. Fearing that he may be the eighth husband to die by marriage, Tobias invokes ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, briefly recounts the creation of Adam and Eve, and claims καὶ νῦν, κύριε, οὐ διὰ πορνείαν ἐγὼ λαμβάνω τὴν ἀδελφήν μου ταύτην, ἀλλ’ ἐπ’ ἀληθείας (Tob 8:7).49

In response to the prayers of Tobit and Sarah, Tob 3:16 records either, “At that very moment, the prayer of both was heard in the presence of the glory of God,” or “Καὶ

46 Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, GAP (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 35, claims that the book of Tobit often uses ἐλεημοσύνη “in a wider sense” that is synonymous with δικαιοσύνη.

47 If αὐτῶν and αὐτοῖς are personifications of sin in Sir 23:1, then falling into sin, even unknown sin, is the precursor to falling into the hands of enemies.

48 Cf. Wis 14:12—Ἄρχη γὰρ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων, εὑρέσεις δὲ αὐτῶν φθορὰ ζωῆς.

49 The prayers of Sarah and Tobias are also interesting because of the physical characteristics of prayer they describe: outstretched hands, praying at a window, standing, and the communal Amen. Sarah’s innocence may also be attested in her prayer: καὶ νῦν, κύριε, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, εἰς ἀποκατάστασιν μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου εἰς σὲ δέδωκα (Tob 3:12). 1 Enoch 4:5 says the fallen angels cannot lift their eyes toward heaven because of their sin.
either, Tob 12:12 reveals Raphael’s “stunning revelation” to Sarah and Tobit, ἐγὼ προσήγαγον τὸ μνημόσυνον τῆς προσευχῆς ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἁγίου.

Similarly, the seer of 1 Enoch writes prayers of remembrance seeking forgiveness for the fallen angels and reads the document before the Lord (1 Enoch 13:4). In each case, the act of writing and reciting intercessory prayer was as important as the content of the prayer.

C) Summary

Remembrance language in 2T Jewish prayer was organised by the prototypical frames FAITHFULNESS/UNFAITHFULNESS and CRISIS. Remembering God and his ordinances was a signature of righteousness for the petitioner, and not remembering (ignorance) or forgetting (disobedience) was the signature of sin. This does not mean that 2T Judaism was a system of works righteousness. Instead, it affirms the two ways theology (Deut 30:15–18) which is set in the context of remembrance and restoration (Deut 30:1–6), and uses the embodied locative descriptions heart and soul.

In crisis situations, God was beseeched to remember the supplicant, the people, and his covenant. Remembrance language could be explicit (“Remember me”), or implied by reciting past deeds of the Lord. In both cases, the idea was the same. God remembering equalled God acting in a distinct manner defined by his righteousness and mercy that was consistent with past actions. God’s righteousness was expected to defeat arrogant nations and relieve an oppressed Israel. When God acted in judgment of Israel, his mercy was expected to mollify his judgment because God’s remembrance was an assurance that he would always protect his people, even if he tested them through the trial of oppression.

50 The first option is the NETS translation of the longer version of Tobit (GII), and the second is the shorter version (GI) used in the Logos Septuagint.

51 “[I]t was I who brought and read the record of your prayer before the glory of the Lord” (NETS translation). The reason was faithfulness in almsgiving. See also, the connection between the prayers and almsgiving of Cornelius ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνημόσυνον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 10:4).

52 For the idea of the prayers of the righteous “ascending” to heaven see 1 Enoch 47:1–4.

53 Deut 30:1—καὶ δέξῃ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; 30:6—καὶ περικαθαριεῖ κύριος τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ σπέρματός σου ἀγαπᾶν κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς (ψυχῆς) σου, ἵνα ζήσης σὺ.

54 Note Bautch’s observation “Fittingly, there are texts written after the exile reporting that God "remembered" the covenant with Abraham (e.g. Lev 26:42), a divine act tantamount to reaffirming the exiles and assuring them that they will fare better in the future than they have in the recent past,” Glory and Power, 44.
Regardless of circumstance, 2T Jewish prayer naturally emerged as remembrance before the Lord at the interface of dynamic personal engagement.

5.4) Distinguishing between Jewish and Graeco-Roman Prayer

Wright is correct that the distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish religion needs more nuance than stating that neither the Greeks nor the Romans had a universal story within which all of life could be centred. However, the necessary nuance does not negate Harder’s distinction. Here, the difference between 2T Judaism and Gentile religion is understood as divergent conceptual ontologies represented by their respective religious narratives. Historically, the difference manifested in distinctly different ontic levels of tolerable variation. Phenomenally, it manifested in distinctly different ontic expectations for the prototypical function of religious narrative. The 2T Jewish hermeneutic of living in the Torah through prayer gave the historic narrative an entirely different dimension than it had in Graeco-Roman mythology. For Second Temple Jews, the narrative was never historic, but a present, and readily accessible, ontology, hence Paul’s use of Deut 30:14, ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμα ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου (Rom 10:8).

5.5) Conclusion: Sketching the Topology of Paul’s Prayer Language

As Rowland says, “In two respects the Pauline letters resemble the contours of much of Jewish literature: the quest for holiness and the practice of religion in an alien culture.” The analysis in Part III is built on the premise that Paul disproportionately blended his Jewish prayer tradition and Graeco-Roman socio-cultural religious expression to create a level of complexity that was sufficient for a distinctively Christian prayer language to emerge and survive. The question is what distinguished Paul from the different threads of Jewish identity in the 2TP?

Answering that question requires describing the deviations between the variations of Jewish expression in the 2TP. Christine Hayes argues that competing interpretations of

55 Wright, P&FG, 1:247. e.g. Leon Morris, “The Saints and the Synagogue,” in Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honour of Ralph P. Martin, ed. Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige, JSNTSup 87 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), 40, “[T]here was no equivalent of the Jewish idea of a body of revealed truth which it was the business of everybody to know and practice.” George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 281, “A consequence of the idea of revealed religion which was of the utmost moment in all the subsequent history of Judaism was the endeavour to educate the whole people in its religion.”

56 See 2.2 above and the discussion on reciprocity in 8.1.

Jewish identity were inextricably linked to ideas concerning the permeability of the conceptual boundary between Jew and Gentile vis-à-vis the intrinsic impurity of Gentiles and the possibility of their purification. However, Gabriele Boccaccini argues that Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism are the sole survivors of *Middle Judaism*, rather than necessarily distinct religions, and that other forms of Middle Judaism developed a more universalistic view of Jew-Gentile relations than did Christianity. Either way, Paul’s method of Torah reading and use of prayer language to justify the acceptance of the Gentiles qua Gentiles into the Christ-covenant does not seem to be enough to entail a bifurcation from 2T Judaism.

The same is true for the concept of the resurrection from the dead in Jewish theology. Neil Gillman argues convincingly that, “The death of death marks the final step in the triumph of the monotheistic God.” Jon Levenson shows that the expectation for an eschatological physical resurrection was not “a total *novum*” invented in the 2TP, but the result of a complex interaction between of oral and written Torah-tradition concerning the binding of Isaac, the giving of the Torah, and the resurrection of the dead. It seems that the complex unity of 2T Judaism is far easier to describe than the variations.

Part III argues that Paul’s prayer language was an integral part of his theologising in which the claim that Jesus’ resurrection was the “death of death,” the final restoration of Israel, and the inauguration of a life-structured ontology was too particular, too embodied, to be accommodated as another possible interpretation of the Torah meta-narrative. Regardless of Paul’s connection to Rabbinic Judaism, the line between 2T Jewish prayer and Paul’s missional use of prayer is captured by W.D. Davies: “It was not the inadequacy of Judaism, not the fact that the Judaism which Paul knew was an inferior product of the Diaspora … but the impact of the new factor that entered into his ken when he encountered … Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah with all that this implied.”

---


However, Paul did not invent ‘Christian theology,’ or single-handedly turn theology into a fundamental different process.\textsuperscript{63} The impression that he did is a natural, though mistaken, result of the percentage of the NT comprised by his letters and centuries of debate centred on those letters. Because human scale scenarios minimize the number of participants, it is more natural to think in terms of Pauline theology, rather than consider his mission as a complex adaptive system that functioned as part of a larger complex adaptive system from which a singular constraining identity emerged. For example, Witherington writes:

> If we miss the fact that Paul is essentially a sectarian person who is drawing on his heritage for a new social situation and community, we can fall prey to misunderstandings… One of the great paradoxes of Paul’s thought is that at the very heart of his symbolic world, his gospel and his theologizing is a contingent historical event and God’s response to it: the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus…Theology, then, is not a set of eternal truths of reason or an abstract philosophical system. Christian theology always has one foot in human history.\textsuperscript{64}

The argument unfolded of over the remaining study is that the existence of a contingent historical event at the very heart of Paul’s cognition and language is no paradox. As the creation of human scale scenarios, every theology always has one foot in human history. Though Paul was tasked with articulating what was, indeed, a new situation, the uniqueness of the Christ-covenant was such that Paul had no interest in sectarianism, and drew upon his Jewish heritage and parts of Graeco-Roman tradition to destroy such notions.\textsuperscript{65} The reason was as simple as it was confounding. The new cosmic situation in which Paul found himself was that, in the Christ-narrative, \textit{Christian} theology had become human, and was walking with both feet in a new human history which was emerging into life instead of plodding towards death.

\textsuperscript{63} Contra, Wright, \textit{P&FG}, 1:26. This would only be possible if Paul was the only person to report a sensorimotor experience of the resurrected Jesus.

\textsuperscript{64} Ben Witherington III, \textit{The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus} (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 262–263.

\textsuperscript{65} Cf. Barclay, \textit{The Gift}, 350, “The Christ-event as gift is thus the foundation of Paul’s Gentile mission, in which Paul resists attempts to reinstitute preconstituted hierarchies of ethnic or social worth, and forms alternative communities that take their bearings from this singular event.”
Part III: Paul’s Prayer Language as Emergent Embodied Complexity

Part III describes how Paul’s prayer language emerged as part of the complexity necessary for Christianity to survive as an independent complex adaptive religious system. The guiding questions are, “How do specific uses of prayer language reflect new potential ontic possibilities that defined the differentiating complexity for sustained independence?” and, “How is Paul’s prayer language a manifestation of his volitional interaction with his historic environment?” The general assertion is that potential answers only emerge as functions of the prototypical connections between his prayer language and the Christ-narrative as the embodied cognitive frame that allowed him to compress the diffuse arrays of his experience and thought into manageable and relevant expression; hence, Ostmeyer’s spatiotemporal inferences.

A brief exemplary analysis of Rom 15:7–13 provides a good segue. The opening injunction compresses the identity of the audience with the identity of Christ to create a prototypical Christian identity described by the phrase εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, which compresses purpose and result into a singular reciprocal concept. Paul justifies the instruction by invoking the Christ-narrative (15:8–9), and the procedural marker καθὼς γέγραπται yields a unique emergent world which is distinguishable from the past and the present, and yet dependent upon both. Paul’s use of καθὼς γέγραπται signifies more than a re-presentation to establish authority and claim historic continuity because it maps the teleology of the historic covenant into the person of Jesus as the telic manifestation of that covenant.

As an example of emergent motion, Rom 15:7–13 does not define the Christ-narrative in terms of the historic narrative, or vice-versa. Rather, Paul conceptualises the physical resurrection of Jesus as the emergence of ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός from within the historic narrative. The progression developed through the citations begins from the sensorimotor necessity of telling the story in speech and song. In the narrative, the ἔθνη and τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ are blended into the unique identity of the universal οἱ λαοί. Since Paul does not offer this progression as proof that the ἔσται ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰσαακ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχει ἐθνῶν, but as the manifestation of that reality (recapitulated by ἐπ’ αὐτῷ θηνη ἐλπιοῦσιν), it is not a linear the progression culminating in the conversion of the Gentiles, but the emergence of the purity of the Gentiles an original part of the historic covenant.

Furthermore, the blended space describes an ontology which is independent from any conditions to be fulfilled by the audience. The image schema is an idealised event in
which speech acts are the essential physical acts for the emergent consciousness it describes. The speech acts are prayer language because the blended space is explicitly organised by the prototypical worship frame. In the blend, the speech acts of worship, which include interpersonal speech acts as well as those directed specifically to God, execute the transformative power of the truth of God.

This is evidenced by Paul’s prayer for his audience in 15:13. Because Paul’s choice of the moniker Ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος was conditioned by the phrase ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν, the prayer is a specific example of the confession in 15:9b and a specific example of the implication of 15:12. Therefore, the prayer compressed all the speech acts in the citations into an integrated unit that represents a prototypical prayer narrative. This allows Paul to compress the identity of the audience and the historic ἔθνη into a fluid either/or, both/and relationship as they are assimilated into the new covenant.

The ethical and moral imperatives placed upon the audience as conditions for experiencing the blended ontology are also emergent properties of the blend. The injunction to interact with one another as Christ had interacted with them compresses the identity of the audience with the identity of Christ. This is not a disembodied, mystical union, but a blend that maps the Christological ontology onto the audience so that they are seamlessly incorporated into the historic covenant. The implication is that the interpersonal interaction has a teleological order of growth commensurate with Christ’s interaction with them—the glorification of the God of Israel by those who were ontically non-Jewish, but ontologically immersed in the emerging ontic structure of eternal life.

Paul’s identity is also compressed with the identity of Christ as the one who gives praise/confession among the Gentiles. The prayer in 15:13 emerges from the plurality of Paul’s life. It is simultaneously his own participation in the Christ-covenant and a specific example for his audience as to how the injunction in 15:7 might be fulfilled. However, Paul does not explain how this is possible. Apparently, he thought that illustrating the Christ-covenant ontology with prayer language made the answer self-evident.
The direct analysis of Paul’s prayer language begins with his prayer reports because the embodied analysis entails most of the issues discussed thus far. Using Ostmeyer’s principle of herausarbeiten, this chapter challenges the conventional hermeneutic of categorising the εὐχαριστέω reports near the beginning of the letters as captatio benevolentiae/exordia and labelling the reports which appear in the letter body as less formal or more personal. The following embodied analysis shows that Paul’s use of prayer and remembrance as a function of embodied participation in the Christ-covenant is the common denominator for all the prayer reports. Therefore, describing the missional function of the reports often necessitates including narrative material which is generally not considered part of the reports proper.

A prototypical prayer report compresses time and space so that the reported prayer is actualised in the report. This analysis shows how space compression blended identities of Paul and his audiences into a unique category of the ideal believer as an embodied manifestation of the universal divine/human solidarity which Paul believed was established by the resurrection of Jesus. Time compression emphasised new ontic possibilities created by the Christ-covenant as the eternal life-structured ontology that was emerging into the universal sensorimotor experience. As such, Paul’s prayer reports were mnemonic narratives that employed and developed the constitutive memory of the emerging communities into an embodied hermeneutic of obedience and differentiation.

The first section addresses conventional questions concerning the difficulty of delimiting the εὐχαριστέω reports, and proposes reading Rom 1:11–12 as a prayer report. The second section analyses the prayer reports in Gal 1:24, Rom 10:1, 2 Cor 13:7–9, as emergent mnemonic narratives for Paul’s conceptualisation of Christ-covenant participation, despite epistolary position or the explicit use of remembrance language.

6.1) Integrating Prayer, Narrative, and Humanity in Paul’s εὐχαριστέω Reports

Past research shows that the εὐχαριστέω reports contain or foreshadow much of the content in the respective letters. The present concern is to ascertain what the reports reveal about Paul’s conceptualisation of his mission and how he was to execute it. This section engages the εὐχαριστέω reports through some conventional opinions that maintain a degree of categorical separation between the reports proper and the wider epistolary context.
A) Remembrance as both Thanksgiving and Intercession in 1 Thessalonians

First Thessalonians is a prime example of the difficulty with using rhetorical structures to analyse Paul’s prayers. O’Brien says this thanksgiving section is the most difficult to delimit in the Pauline corpus, but that it is reasonable to consider 1:2 to 3:13 as the full extent. However, he does not think the immediate context (1 Thess 1:2–10) contains an intercessory prayer report. Similarly, Wiles says, “the clearly petitionary sentence in this elaborate thanksgiving section is postponed until 3:9ff,” and wonders, “Whether such a brief prayer-report would have been consciously intended for instruction in the content and method of praying.” Conversely, an embodied hermeneutic can include the narrative in verses 6–10 as integral to the prayer report as an exemplary pattern of intercession.

The principle question in 1 Thess. 1:2–5 is the relationship between Εὐχαριστοῦμεν and the ensuing participles μνείαν ποιούμενοι, μνημονεύοντες, and εἰδότες. Wanamaker says they are dependent, but not “logically parallel since ‘making mention in our prayers’ does not constitute grounds for giving thanks to God, while ‘remembering your work of faith’ and ‘knowing your election’ do.” O’Brien takes μνημονεύοντες to be the immediate cause of Paul’s thanksgiving, and εἰδότες to be the ultimate cause. Wiles prefers the causal relationship, but reads μνημονεύοντες as referencing both μνείαν ποιούμενοι and εὐχαριστοῦμεν. He concludes that the phrase “probably indicates not so much a formal and dutiful calling to mind of the converts, but a continual, almost involuntary remembering that betokens his unfailing sense of pastoral responsibility for them.”

Older commentaries notice that μνημονεύοντες “may not be properly causal.” William Neil’s translation, “as we recall,” seems the best alternative to a strictly causal sense. Lightfoot says, εἰδότες gives the reason, “whereas the previous participles explain the

---

1 O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 143–146.
2 O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 144.
3 Wiles, Prayers, 176, 183.
4 Charles A. Wanamaker, The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 74.
5 O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 146, 150.
6 Wiles, Prayers, 177.
7 John Eadie, A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians (London: Macmillan, 1877), 35.
circumstances of εὐχαριστοῦμεν.”⁹ As in Mordecai’s prayer, the preference here is to construe μνημονεύοντες as a circumstance of means—by continually remembering.¹⁰ The logical progression is, what (Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ), when (πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν μνείαν ποιούμενοι), how (ἀδιαλείπτως μνημονεύοντες), and why (εἰδότες κτλ). Therefore, ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν is not a stylistic Pauline extension, but the closing bracket to ἀδιαλείπτως μνημονεύοντες, “showing where the remembrance of these graces was experienced.”¹¹ This places Paul squarely in the 2T Jewish tradition of remembering (i.e. recounting) the deeds of others in the presence of God.

Rather than an involuntary remembering, μνημονεύοντες is an intentional action which fits Ostmeyer’s description, “Durch den χάρις-Zuspruch ist die Gemeinde in die durch Christus ermöglichte Gnadensphäre hineingenommen.”¹² Die Gemeinde includes both Paul and his audience because verses 6–10 are more than “an intimate and personal discussion of the Thessalonians’ example to other believers.”¹³ They constitute a thanksgiving supplication in which Paul recounts the faithfulness of the Thessalonians. This is neither epistolary flourish nor an attempt to build rapport with the audience, but characteristic of the traditional prayer which Paul inherited. Were it a direct prayer, verses 4–10 could be introduced by μνήσθητι, κύριε.

Note that the entirety of 1:4–2:12 is a retelling marked by phrases which presume a common conceptual space between Paul and his audience: Αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε (2:1), καθὼς οἴδατε (2:2, 2:5), and καθάπερ οἴδατε (2:11). Μνημονεύετε γάρ in 2:9 should be added to the list since there is little reason to think that Paul was refreshing the Thessalonians’ collective memory. Neither is the recounting offered as evidence for a structured argument. Instead, Paul repeats the thanksgiving statement in 2:13 (εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἀδιαλείπτως) and follows it with another recounting of their shared faith history. This recounting culminates in a profession of God’s judgement against those who would oppose them, which also fits the 2T Jewish pattern.

---


¹⁰ Here, πάντοτε qualifies περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν μνείαν ποιούμενοι, and ἀδιαλείπτως qualifies μνημονεύοντες.

¹¹ Eadie, Thessalonians, 38.

¹² Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 61.

¹³ O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 153.
It is, therefore, plausible to consider the entire narrative in 1:3–2:20 as a prayer report, or more accurately, prayer reports. If the anxiety Paul professed in 3:1–5 is taken seriously, recounting the Thessalonians’ faithfulness and steadfastness was his intercession for them because recounting functioned as an active re-presentation of their Christ-covenant participation. In effect, Paul prayed, “Remember, O Lord, your covenant servants.”

The difficulty is that the modern conception of prayer is punctiliar—hence Wiles’ notion about the postponement of the clearly petitionary sentence. However, Paul’s inherited narrative 2T Jewish prayer hermeneutic could be described by Deuteronomy 7:17–19:

> If you say to yourself, “These nations are more numerous than I; how can I dispossess them?” do not be afraid of them. Just remember what the Lord your God (μνείᾳ μνησθήσῃ δόσα ἐποίησεν κύριος ὁ θεός σου) did to Pharaoh and to all Egypt, the great trials that your eyes saw, the signs and wonders, the mighty hand and the outstretched arm by which the Lord your God brought you out. The Lord your God will do the same to all the peoples of whom you are afraid.

Here μνείᾳ μνησθήσῃ indicates a verbal recital of the historic covenant narrative. Therefore, it should be expected that the worry and prayer presented ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ described in 1 Thessalonians 3 would be accompanied by an extended narrative. Thus, the summary statement in 1 Thess 2:19 (τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἢ χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως—ἡ ὁὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς—ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ;) explains the extensiveness of the preceding prayer report and combines with 1:10 to reveal that the specific framing narrative for Paul’s petitionary thanksgiving (as well as his conceptualisation of his mission) was the parousia of Jesus and accompanying physical resurrection of believers. As in Deuteronomy, Paul countered the Thessalonians’ troubles and his own distress by recounting the signs and wonders which they had all seen and the specific event which they should expect to see.

As such, Paul’s petitionary thanksgiving emerged from the solidarity he perceived between himself and his audience as cohabitants within the narrative. The missional function of the thanksgiving was two-fold. As a speech act, it prepared his audience for the parousia by strengthening and protecting their faith in the event through an extended epistolary remembrance of the Christ-narrative, its subsequent effects, and its implications in the presence of God. As an exemplar for petitionary prayer, it would strengthen their participation in the self-organising and self-regulating complexity of emerging Christianity.
B) Thanksgiving as Intercession for Physical Presence in 1 Thess 3:9–10

First Thessalonians 3:1–6 are narrative in the basic sense of presenting a sequence of events. In verses 7–8, the intense life-or-death image conceptualises the impact of the Thessalonians’ faithfulness upon Paul. This declaration is followed by an indirect εὐχαριστεῦω report that summarily references the earlier petitionary thanksgiving and includes a specific petitionary prayer report—εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ υστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.14

The problem is construing υστερήματα, especially given the relief Paul expressed concerning the Thessalonians and the generally positive tone of the letter. Yet, it is possible that the larger context beginning with 2:17 suggests that υστερήματα concerns the lack of physical contact between Paul and the Thessalonians rather than a lack of doctrinal certainty. The image elicited by ἀπορφανίζω creates a powerfully emotive conceptual space concerning the deep sense of loss created by death which cannot be adequately described as metaphoric.15

Notice the fluidity of the death motif as Paul moved from 2:17 to 3:13. The death experienced by separation is replaced by potential death which Paul would suffer if the Thessalonians’ faith had faltered. This death is resolved in 3:8—ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στῆκετε ἐν κυρίῳ. The immediate response to this resolution is the prayer report of 3:9. However, the death experienced by the separation remains, and its resolution is the subject of the prayer report in 3:10 and the direct prayer in 3:11. The pain of separation is potentially resolved by 3:10–11 because a positive outcome would signify the reversal of the death experienced in 2:17. This suggests that, whatever υστερήματα represents, it could not be fully resolved without Paul’s physical presence.16 However, even though Paul certainly had some expectation that his letter would have a positive effect on the faith of his audience, this does not mean that Paul’s physical presence was the totality of υστερήματα.

---

14 See 10.4 for the discussion of νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας.

15 Contra Wanamaker, Thessalonians, 120. His concern was the passive voice of ἀπορφανισθέντες “would require Paul to be portraying himself as an orphaned child.” Cf. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 196–197 for the argument that ἀπορφανισθέντες designates Paul and his co-workers as orphans.

Jane Heath arrives at the same conclusion using the ancient concept of *enargeia* as the wider cognitive context—“that quality of language which makes the audience experience something absent as if present.” 17 She proposes that Paul used the Thessalonians’ collective memory to portray something beyond the previous experience of the audience by evoking two ‘moments’: “[T]he ‘ontological moment’ of *enargeia* persuades the audience that what is absent is really present; the ‘affective moment’ of *enargeia* makes the audience aware of the tension between seeming presence and real absence. Longing for real presence ensues.”18

Heath claims that Paul did not intend to create an ontological sense of his presence as the ultimate resolution. Instead, he used *εἴσοδος* to evoke the parousia of Christ as the resolution which his presence among them anticipated. She argues that the ancient understanding of imagination was not prototypically CREATIVE but MIMETIC—i.e. it drew upon preconceived notions of reality and values within a common cultural experience.19 Thus, Paul uses “imaginative memory” in 2:17–20 and 3:16–13 to communicate his conception of mutual presence as “an experience that anticipates the parousia” inasmuch as the *enargeia* of the letter is a real, but partial, experience of the mutual presence of Paul and his audience.20 Applying the existential and cognitive dissonance inherent in *enargeia* to the interpretation of ὑστερήματα, Heath concludes, “what is ‘lacking’ is presumably the solid presence to one another” rather than a “qualitative shortfall.”21 Therefore, she rejects categorising 1 Thessalonians as a friendship letter based on the characteristic ‘absent-yet-present’ motif because Paul’s relationship to his audience is guided by the concept of apostolicity, not friendship.22

The fact that Heath used a different conceptual point of beginning to derive the same conclusion for ὑστερήματα as presented here strengthens the argument that structural analysis can obscure the phenomenon of consciousness. However, her claim that the ancient philosophical category of *enargeia* signifies a distinction between the ancient and


18 Heath “Absent Presences,” 5.

19 Heath “Absent Presences,” 11. She also emphasis the role of remembrance in Deut 17.

20 Heath “Absent Presences,” 19.


modern mind needs two corrections. First, this distinction must be understood in terms of
cognitive perspective, not an actual difference in cognitive processing. Embodied
cognition considers mimetic imagination to be an inherent property of human memory.
Sensorimotor data referenced through memory is still dependent upon actual physical
experience. Negative memory encourages actions which avoid previous negative
experience, and positive memory encourages the repetition of actions which are connected
to previous positive experiences.

Second, the use of *enargeia* in contemporaneous Hellenistic philosophy does not
necessitate that Paul’s extensive use of memory reveals an awareness or intentional
engagement. The mimetic use of memory was well established in Jewish literary tradition.
The analogy between *enargeia* and Paul’s language only necessarily illustrates the
universal struggle to understand and describe the idea of transcendence. It could be that
the Hellenistic *enargeia* and the 2T Jewish mimetic hermeneutic represent the
phenomenon of parallel development.23

The merit of Heath’s assertion is recognising that, in modern Western culture, the image
schema elicited by the term *imagination* is prototypically CREATIVE and not MIMETIC,
which does create a hermeneutical dissonance regarding Paul’s use of language. The
critical point is that while Paul’s awareness of the mimetic properties of memory can be
debated, the mimetic function of his memory language cannot, and that does require
exegetical attention.

The descriptive power of an embodied hermeneutic is such that it attends to both creativity
and mimesis as prototypical aspects of human cognition and language. The ability to
experience what Heath describes as *enargeia* is the creative integration of sensorimotor
perception into a conceptual blend. The sensorimotor perception related to receiving a
letter creates a blended conceptual space which maps the genuine presence from the input
space of the sender, in this case Paul, but does not map physicality. The receiver lives in
this blended space as a function of the interactive interface organised by the joint
attentional frame of sender-letter-audience. When the letter is not the anchor of a joint
attentional frame (i.e. after the letter is read), the metonymical function of the letter-as-
sender is removed, and the blend dissipates. The longing that ensues is the sensorimotor
perception of the dissonance between the blend in which it was possible to experience the
presence of the sender and the lack of direct sensorimotor perception of the sender. The

23 Parallel development occurs when similar concepts have no ontogenetic connections.
fact that memory elicits the desire to overcome that dissonance is evidence that physical presence is necessary for direct and global cognitive access.

In summary, the Christ-narrative claims that the resurrected Jesus of Nazareth is the embodiment of an ontological change that excludes death from the human experience, and the consummation of the story is conceptualised as a scene comprised of the physical presence of Jesus and the physical presence of covenant believers. Therefore, Paul’s presence in the Thessalonian community could resolve the ὑστερήματα inasmuch as his mission was an embodied exemplar of the new life-structured ontology in the midst of a death-structured ontic perception (hence the designation ‘Apostle of Christ’). Yet, the full resolution of the ὑστερήματα requires the physical parousia of the resurrected Jesus.

C) Does 1 Cor 1:4–9 include a petitionary prayer report?

O’Brien says 1 Cor 1:4–9 does not include a petitionary prayer report because it lacks customary terms for prayer and the ἵνα-clause, or its equivalent, to introduce the content of the prayer; therefore, “An investigation of this passage, therefore, will not reveal anything about Paul’s intercessory prayers for his converts in Corinth.”24 However, Wiles considers 1 Cor 1:8 as a potential wish prayer which stood for the customary prayer report because the future indicative βεβαιώσει could be equated with the optative form that typifies wish prayers.25 The present analysis considers the lack of any typical prayer-term as inconsequential, and identifies two explicit petitionary prayers and an indirect doxology.

This analysis hinges on the construal of ὅτι (1:5). If ὅτι is causal, then verses 5–7 are epexegetic of ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθένη ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, and have a unified causal relationship to Paul giving thanks to God. However, Margaret Sim says that ὅτι, like ἵνα, is a procedural marker for

the reader to expect a representation of a potential or desirable state of affairs from the perspective of the writer or subject . . . there is no logical semantic content of ‘because’ attached to this particle. It may introduce a representation which gives cause for previous thought or action, but this is inferred from the context and is not part of the ‘meaning’ of the particle.26

Read as a procedural marker, ὅτι introduces verses 5–9 as Paul’s representation of the εὐχαριστέω report in verse 4, and functions, like ἵνα in Philippians 1:9, to introduce the


26 Sim, Marking Thought, 172.
content of Paul’s prayer.\textsuperscript{27} In this construal, the first petitionary prayer is contained in verses 5–7,\textsuperscript{28} and the second in verse 8.\textsuperscript{29} The focus of the first petition is the actions of the audience, and the focus of the second is the state of the audience. Both prayers have the same compressions discussed so far because they have the same teleological function — conceptualising the consummation of the Christ-covenant.

For two reasons, ὅτι also function as a procedural marker for the final statement (πιστὸς ὁ θεός, δι’ οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) as an indirect doxology that represents Paul’s petitionary thanksgiving for the Corinthian community. First, it is reminiscent of the direct doxological confessions associated with the petitionary prayers of the 2T Jewish traditions. Second, it represents Paul’s image of himself in prayer which was evoked in his self-conscious awareness as an emergent property of issuing the εὐχαριστέω report.\textsuperscript{30}

D) Is Philippians 1:3–11 a divided report?

Influenced by Schubert, Wiles says Phil 1:6–8 interrupts the εὐχαριστέω report “with a personal statement of encouragement, stressing the intimate partnership that inspires his prayers.”\textsuperscript{31} O’Brien considers verses 7–8 a warm and affectionate interruption, but includes verse 6 in the report under one condition: “The αὐτὸ τούτο, as the object of πεποιθώς, does not point back to v. 5 as though the reason for the certainty was their past co-operation. Rather, it refers to what follows. Paul gave thanks because of a certain conviction.”\textsuperscript{32} Although O’Brien writes, “It may be correctly said that the parousia underlay much of Paul’s thinking,” his commitment to form criticism yields the conclusion, “But in Phil. 1:6, thanksgiving is not directly linked with that coming.”\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{27} O’Brien, \textit{Thanksgivings}, 30, “The ἵνα-clause expresses not the aim or purpose of Paul’s praying, but rather the content of the prayer or the objects requested by the apostle in his petition.”

\textsuperscript{28} 5 ὅτι ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει, ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς ἕως τέλους ἀνεγκλήτους ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

\textsuperscript{29} 6 καθὼς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν, 7 ὡστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὀπερείσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι ἀπεκδεχομένου τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

\textsuperscript{30} This second reason is described more fully in the following section.

\textsuperscript{31} Wiles, \textit{Prayers}, 204. He cites this as an example of Schubert’s “mixed type” of thanksgiving.

\textsuperscript{32} O’Brien, \textit{Thanksgivings}, 29, 26.

\textsuperscript{33} O’Brien, \textit{Thanksgivings}, 28.
In fairness, O’Brien does state that there is no fundamental distinction between the actions of the Philippians as the grounds of Paul’s thanksgiving and the activity of God as the ultimate basis, and that Paul viewed their actions as evidence for God’s current activity in their midst. Furthermore, he relates Paul’s use of πέποιθα to the influence of the Psalms, and asserts that Paul’s use of φρονέω makes “it abundantly clear that the way one thinks is intimately related to the way one behaves. A person’s thinking and striving cannot be seen in isolation from the overall direction of his or her life.” All of this makes his assertion about the referent for πεποιθὼς αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦτο and his opinion about verses 7 and 8 quite curious. The former seems to result from the concern to preserve the absolute definition of God’s mercy as unmerited favour, and the latter from overvaluing form criticism.

The embodied alternative is that verses 6–8 constitute the human scale scenario elicited for Paul by his εὐχαριστέω report because they contain the sensorimotor anchors that shaped his mental image schema of the Philippians as he prayed for them. As such, verses 6–8 naturally emerge from verses 3–5 which elicited, for Paul, the mental scenario in which he was in the act of praying for the audience. If this is a reasonable picture of how Paul fit into his mission, then it is a good example of how natural conceptual blending is to human cognition. The following analysis does not claim to explain why he included this description of himself, but only a reasonable description of how these remarks can be considered an integrated part of verses 3–11 as a single εὐχαριστέω report.

In verses 3–4, the diverse array of his individual memories, prayer times, and the people for whom he prayed are compressed into a single prayer event characterized by a single emotion. Verse five compresses the content of that same array into the integrated unit represented as τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Furthermore, the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν is a time compression that moves the εὐχαριστέω report from a past event into a real-time sensorimotor action presented to the audience as the letter is read.

Therefore, the teleological order of growth represented in verse six naturally motivated the blend in the previous verses which gave the simultaneous impression of direct access and


36 See O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 29–30, n. 50 for why τὸ τοῦ προσεύχομαι in verse 9 “can only refer back to δέχοντη ποιούμενος.”

37 πάση τῇ μνείᾳ υμῶν is understood here to reference Paul’s memories, contra O’Brien, Introductory Thanksgivings, 23.
global insight to all the compressed prayers, their contents, and the related emotions.38 Like the argument above, δὴ is as a procedural marker for the phrase πεποιθῶς αὐτὸ τοῦτο that introduces a potential or desirable human scale scene of an embodied act. Any lexicalised causally is due to the limits of embodied cognition and language.

The problem with verse six is the sensorimotor experience of time as a linear progression versus the emergent time that frames the Christ-covenant. The initial impression of the implied motion between ὁ ἐναρξάμενος and ἐπιτελέσει ἀχρὶ ἡμέρας Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ elicits a line segment framed by punctiliar moments of beginning and ending.39 Rather than trying to distinguish between causes that adjudicate the relationship between punctiliar moments, it is better to understand verse six as an emergent time compression that maps the motion of the work maturing into the purview of sensorimotor perception in a telic event comprised of the physical presence of Jesus and the physical presence of believers. From this perspective, the images in the scene of verse seven naturally emerge in the course of the prayer report because δεσμοῖς and the collocation τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου are compressions of the specific people, objects, and events which constituted Paul’s sensorimotor anchors for conceptualizing the solidarity that, to him, must exist between those who participate in the Christ-covenant. Therefore, the emergent meaning of συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος is the semantic equivalent of τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

The same is true for the oath in verse eight, which is treated in detail in chapter nine. The significant point here is that the oath emerged from Paul’s mental schema of himself in prayer as a natural progression from the opening claim in the εὐχαριστέω report that his Christ-covenant solidarity with the audience constantly motivated his prayers. Given Paul’s previous reference to his chains and the images of the hardships that were related to executing his mission, the oath is a tighter compression of that solidarity because it compresses Paul’s act of prayer with the self-sacrificial love of Jesus. This certainly elicited the image of Jesus’ suffering and death so that the oath emerges as a natural proclamation with an appropriate intensity at this point in the report. Therefore, the degree to which the explicit prayer report in 9–11 specifies the content of the εὐχαριστέω report in 3–5 is mediated by the emotive scale of solidarity represented by the description of Paul in the act of prayer provided by 6–8. The proportional connection between the Philippians’

38 The probability that this was Paul’s conscious effort is negligible because self-conscious awareness and conscious effort are not the same process.

39 Detailed description of implied motion in conceptual blends is presented in chapter seven.
love and their ability to discern how to prepare for the consummation of the Christ-covenant is the same as the connection between Paul’s commitment for them and his ability to prepare them for that eventuality.

Yet, the εὐχαριστέω report in 9–11 does not necessarily map an insufficiency of love in the community. The motion in the prayer of ever-increasing love and an ever-expanding epistemology reflect the characteristics of the motion inherent in the emerging life-structured ontology. Paul’s urgent plea reflects, in part, his conception that a certain degree of actualising the death-defying ontological structure is readily available amidst the death-structured ontic experience. As in 1 Thessalonians, the urgency of the plea reflects his understanding that the full sensorimotor perception of the restructured ontology is dependent upon the physical presence of Jesus. Even though the blend does not map linear time, it does map a human scale scenario animated by an ever-increasing degree of emerging proximity. Thus, the final clause in verse nine is foremost a conceptualization of the telic scene. Whatever physical anchors are elicited must be understood as underdetermined derivatives. Far from being an interjection, verses 6-8 constitute a condensed mnemonic prayer narrative derived from a prototypical PAULINE PRAYER organising frame for the single εὐχαριστέω report in 1:3–11.

E) Prayer and the Emergent Epistemology of the Christ-Covenant in Philemon

In Philemon, there is no dispute that verse six is a petitionary prayer. Yet, Moule once remarked that, “Unless and until further ἐπίγνωσις is given to Christian interpreters,” the exact meaning of the prayer must remain obscure. An embodied hermeneutic offers further ἐπίγνωσις if the implied motion of ἐνεργής γένηται is construed as an emergent increase in Philemon’s knowledge concerning the significance of his actions as embodied manifestations of the life-structured ontology amidst the ontic experience structured by death. The motion cannot be punctiliar because verses 4–5 create the mental space for verse six in a manner that reflects the entrenched 2T Jewish Gebetsideal of recounting the deeds of the faithful in the presence of God.

Here, the circumstance of ἀκούων should be translated temporally instead of causally (NRSVA). The human scale scenario is that when Paul hears about Philemon’s covenant participation, he recounts Philemon’s deeds in the presence of God as part of his own covenant participation. Verse six, then, culminates Paul’s εὐχαριστέω intercession for

---

Philemon, and, like 1 Thessalonians, can be understood as direct speech: μνήσθητι, κύριε the deeds of your servant Philemon and grant him the knowledge to understand the significance of his actions as manifestations of your gift of eternal life in the resurrection of Christ Jesus, our Lord.

Thus, verse seven is an integral part of the εὐχαριστέω report as Paul’s own sensorimotor experience of the solidarity which has been repeatedly manifested by Philemon’s behaviour. It is not a captatio benevolentiae, but a genuine expression of Paul’s experience of his relationship with Philemon which was evoked in Paul’s mental schema by the εὐχαριστέω report. It is also evidence that Paul consistently used prayer as a method to maintain the cognitive space that connected prototypical covenant ethics to the physical manifestation of the Christ-covenant. This was not a static maintenance of intellectual assent, but dynamic participation in a teleological emergent interface where the life-structured ontology was readily accessible. A fundamental missional function of Paul’s prayer language was to repeatedly emphasise this accessibility, independent from any contingent circumstance.

F) The Emergence Ontological Solidarity of the Christ-Covenant in Rom 1:8–15

The situation is Romans, as seems so often, has unique difficulties. The problem of delimiting the εὐχαριστέω report centres on the relationship between Paul and the Roman community of believers.41 If Paul and the Romans were essentially unknown to one another, how could he have interceded for them in a manner consistent with his intercessions for communities with whom he is intimately familiar (μνείαν ύμῶν ποιοῦμαι, 1:9)? This analysis presents evidence for a human scale scenario in Rom 8:1–15 which gives the reader an impression of direct access and global insight into an integrated unit that emerged from the same principles exhibited in the εὐχαριστέω reports which Paul wrote to audiences with whom he had a well-established and intimate relationship.

First, it seems unquestionable that πρῶτος in 1:8 is not an ordinal marker, but carries the meaning “most importantly.” Thus, the remainder of the sentence is a blending process structured by a teleological order of growth in which knowledge of the Christ-narrative is mapped as embodied personal knowledge. Though a bit oversimplified, Paul’s essential assumption can be summarised as ‘to know Christ is to know all Christians.’ O’Brien is correct that the phrase ἡ πίστις ύμων καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ should not be

41 For the difficulties on determining the limits of the thanksgiving section in Romans see O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 200–202.
understood as either flattery or exaggeration.42 The cognitive process that Paul reports is the same as in the other letters, because, quite apart from his interpersonal knowledge, Paul adjudicated everyone’s faith based on their deeds as manifestations of prototypical connections to the Christ-narrative. Therefore, his εὐχαριστέω report of recounting the deeds of the Romans in the presence of God as a function of his active apostolic ministry in the Roman community is not categorically different from the one in Philemon. Even though he had interpersonal knowledge of Philemon, the deeds which Paul recounted as part of his thanksgiving petition were, per the reports, made known to him by the same process. The question then becomes whether Paul would have been comfortable with a certain level of disingenuous expression, or if he relied on an epistemological process that created a consistent matrix for genuine evaluation.

Based on accepting the latter, the oath in verse nine is more than a hyperbolic defence for his absence. Again, the details of an alternative understanding are given in the discussion of oaths in chapter nine. The present point is that, in 1:11 and 1:13, the particle ἵνα is procedural marker for understanding what follows as summary of Paul’s intercessions for the Romans which followed the recounting of their deeds as faithful Christ-covenant participants.

When the content of 1:11–15 is compared to the report in 1 Thess 3:9–10, Paul’s desire to visit the Romans is certainly an emergent property of his conceptualisation of the relationship between physical presence and the manifestation of the ontology implicated by the term ἐν Χριστῷ. The fact that it was incumbent upon him to preach in Rome was a genuinely necessary function of his own ability to fulfil his apostolic mission.43 Thus, O’Brien’s assessment of the ὅτι-clause in 1:8 must also be applied to Paul’s claims of reciprocal spiritual benefit as both a motivating factor for his desire to go to Rome and a paraphrase of the content of his regular intercessions on their behalf. The reason no

42 O’Brien, Thanksgivings, 207.

43 See Barclay’s discussion “The Occasion of Romans” in The Gift, 455–459. “It is notable how emphatically Paul presents himself to the Roman believers as “apostle to the Gentiles” in the introductory greeting (1:1, 5; cf. 1:13-14), in a critical part of his argument (11:13), and in the letter’s closing (15:16-21)” (456), and concludes, “The most important exigency that Paul addresses in this letter is the one that he himself will create: his imminent arrival in Rome as “apostle to the Gentiles,” (457). Furthermore, “Failure to recognize this as the primary occasion of the letter, despite what Paul himself says in the letter frame, may arise from disbelief that Paul could consider himself, and his understanding of the good news, a matter of such importance for Gentile believers, even those he has neither converted nor visited” (457, n. 18).
speculation is necessary as to why Paul did not spell out his petitions in verse 1:9, is because he did.⁴⁴

G) Reading Romans 1:11–12 as a prayer report
Although not definitively, Rom 1:11–12 reads more like a prayer report instead of a rhetorical device designed to gain the favour of the audience. In addition to stating Paul’s reason for planning a visit, the report reflects the content of his petitions to God for divine assistance. Yet, the most interesting aspect of reading it as a prayer report is the potential affinity between χάρισμα πνευματικόν and the ύστερηματα in 1 Thess 3:10.

Since the physical presence evoked by the prototypical mental space for mimesis is commonly expressed in terms of sight (“I want to see you so that…”), the fact that both 1 Thess 3:10 and Rom 1:11–12 are dependent upon ἱδεῖν is easily overlooked.⁴⁵ Both reports indicate Paul’s felt need that physical presence was necessary for conducting interpersonal “spiritual” transactions. In an embodied hermeneutic, the creation of spiritual space is not meant to compete with physical space, but to encompass it. If adequate weight is given to the inherent necessity of physical presence for cognition, then, like ύστερηματα, χάρισμα πνευματικόν also encompasses physical interaction between Paul and the Romans. The implications of embodied cognition in relation to both ύστερηματα and χάρισμα πνευματικόν are such that not only was physical presence necessary for the full experience of faith, but that Paul’s prayers for divine intervention in the matter were also cognitively necessary for his mission.

Again, it is not necessary that Paul understood the embodiment principle for it to have influenced his speech. It is enough that his language reveals his felt need for physical presence. Even if Paul’s language is characterized by body/spirit dualism, this does not establish either a dualistic worldview for Paul or for emergent Christianity.⁴⁶ In this case, the embodiment principle limits human cognition so that dualistic language may be unavoidable, and even necessary at times, while remaining ontologically underdetermined.

6.2) Prayer Reports as Prototypical Integrative Narratives
Like the εὐχαριστέω reports, the prayer reports in Gal 1:24, Rom 10:1, and 2 Cor 13:7–9 are emergent manifestations of Paul’s conceptualisation of Christ-covenant participation

⁴⁵ Pun intended.
⁴⁶ See the excursus in 8.5.
mediated by the Christ-narrative. Since, unlike the εὐχαριστέω reports, they do not appear in a conventionally identified rhetorical category, they may appear as random, spontaneous outbursts of emotion or piety. This section shows that they are not categorically different from the εὐχαριστέω reports because they emerged as a natural part of Paul’s embodied execution of his mission.

A) Galatians 1:24: Prayer as Paul’s Prototypical Exegetical Matrix

Because Galatians 1:24 is Paul’s report concerning the prayers of others, it does connote some difference from the other reports. However, since it appears as the culmination of Paul’s historic reconstruction of the significant events that created the phase change in his personal complex adaptive religious system, it is one of the most dramatic representations in the entire corpus of how he conceptualized the function of prayer in his apostolic ministry. Not only is the remark further evidence that Paul considered the act of prayer a significant embodied manifestation of the Christ-covenant, it suggests that Gal 1:13–24 is a representation of Paul’s prototypical mental space for APOSTLE-TO-THE-GENTILES.47

Even though he employs this narrative in the specific context of the Galatian correspondence, it is proposed that some version of the events was necessarily continually operative in his conceptualisation of his identity as an apostle and the subsequent mission. This is a fascinating example of conceptual blending because one function of the report in 1:24 is to resolve the tension created in verses 21–23—ἤ μην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν ὅτι Ο ἀνακοίμησεν τὸν πόρον ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει. Notice how the relationship between the tension and the resolution is dependent upon contradictory blends concerning the efficacy of hearing for acquiring knowledge. On the one hand, μόνον δὲ diminishes the sense of hearing as second-hand knowledge in favour of sight as first-hand experience. This is particularly interesting since Paul used the sense of sight to denote the definitive evidence gathered by the Jerusalem leaders concerning the validity of his apostleship (Gal 2:7). Therefore, μόνον δὲ emphasises that the people of Syria and Cilicia had no direct sensorimotor evidence for glorifying God on his behalf. The resolution presented in 1:24 is Paul’s prototypical belief in the superiority of divinely revealed knowledge over sensorimotor perception—a point he put directly in Rom 8:24.

47 Barclay, The Gift, 350, “Paul’s theology in Galatians is significantly shaped by his conviction, and experience, of the Christ-gift, as the definitive act of divine beneficence, given without regard to worth.”
On the other hand, Gal 1:24 reverses the tension with the emergent meaning that hearing is singularly sufficient to acquire divinely revealed knowledge for manifesting faithful covenant participation. This sufficiency of hearing is also a fundamental aspect of Paul’s prototypical APOSTOLIC MISSION blend (cf. Gal 3:2, Rom 10:17, and 1 Thess 2:13).48 The fascination is that these contradictory blends can inhabit the same mental space without creating any cognitive dissonance. In fact, the emergent meaning of καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν θεόν is simultaneously an act of faith which rebukes the notion that sensorimotor evidence is required for verification, and is presented as verifiable sensorimotor evidence for divine revelation.49

It seems unlikely that the imperfect tense forms of ἦσαν (1:23) and ἐδόξαζον (1:24) signify iterative action, so that there were repeated prayers offered in response to repeated reports of Paul’s activities. Even so, it does appear that the imperfect tense is important to the narrative since it is used in 1:13–14 to narrate Paul’s passionate persecution of the church of God and his zealous progression in his own Jewish tradition. Here, the embodied communicative intent of the imperfect tense in 1:22–23 is understood to express that Paul’s passionate zeal for proclaiming Christ, at minimum, equalled what he exhibited in his former way of life. Thus, the imperfect ἐδόξαζον is Paul’s morphological conceptualisation that the prayers of the churches were proportionately passionate verifications of his mission. The point is that whether Paul was reporting his own prayers or the prayers of others, there is compelling evidence that he understood prayer to be a signature act of Christ-covenant participation.

B) Romans 10:1 and the Salvation of the Jews

The prayer report in Rom 10:1 follows a complex καθὼς γέγραπται blend in which Paul situates a compressed Israel in a “stumbled” relationship to God (Rom 9:33).

Semantically, 10:1 is unnecessary for the argument contained in 10:2–4 because the passage would remain coherent if it were omitted. However, any interjectory notion of the prayer report is mitigated by the compression involved in καθὼς γέγραπται and the

48 Though it is beyond the scope of this thesis, Luke 24:32, John 20:29, and Acts 8:30–31 suggest that the sufficiency of hearing for salvific knowledge and behavior was an ECIN within emergent Christianity.

compressions in the report itself. Fortunately, in this case, Paul explicates the implications of these compressions in Rom 11:11b–12.\textsuperscript{50}

This blend compresses the identity of Paul’s contemporaries with the Jews and Gentiles of the historic narrative which allows Paul to present 11b–12 as the effective ontological worldview that must determine the behaviour of his audience. The report in 10:1 is a natural emergence of Paul’s own belief in that ontology. If the salvation of the Jews meant an nth degree effect on the progress of the Gospel among the Gentiles, it would have been incumbent upon Paul, as an apostle to the Gentiles, to offer prayers for their salvation. Such prayers would not be optional, but requisite for living in the blend which compressed the salvation of the Jews with the salvation of the Gentiles as the singular divine purpose.

For the same reasons, the report functions as an example for the audience to follow. By introducing the report with Ἀδελφοί, Paul compresses his identity with the identity of the audience, thereby issuing an urgent invitation, which borders on a demand, that they offer the same prayers. Minimally, the prayer report in 10:1 is a proactive speech act which anticipates the proposition of the universal access to the divine salvation in 10:12–13 and the rhetorical questions concerning the salvation of Israel (Rom 11:1 and 11:11).

As in the εὐχαριστεῖω reports, Paul uses the human scale scenario of himself in the act of prayer as evidence of the ontology which he was presenting. Although ECS considers this a natural phenomenon, it is not prescriptive. Paul could have easily used another propositional statement to indicate that the stumbling which was written did not signify the rejection or falling away of Israel. Yet, there is a sense in which Rom 10:1–3 reflects the attitude of Jesus’ prayer from the cross “Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they are doing” (Lk 23:34a, NRSVA).\textsuperscript{51} Paul’s emphasis on the ignorance of the Jews mirrors Luke’s contrast between forgiveness and knowledge. Paul does not simply pattern his prayers on the prayers of Jesus. He prays for the Jews as a Christ-figure; hence, a Christ-ian. Most telling is the blend in Rom 11:15 between the Christ-narrative and Paul’s narrative concerning the Jews: εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλαλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσλημψις εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν. This suggests that the concept of bodily resurrection was

\textsuperscript{50} ὀλλὰ τὸ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ παραξενίλοια αὐτοῦς. \textsuperscript{12} εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου καὶ τὸ ἔθνη αὐτῶν πλούτος ἐθνῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν.

both an entrenched conceptual network for Paul and an emergent property of his use of prayer language. When Paul reports that he prays for the salvation of the Jews, he means that he prays for their salvation from death, which entails their belief in the emerging life-structured ontology created by the resurrection of Jesus.

C) Intercession and Covenant Maintenance in 2 Cor 13:7–9

In 2 Corinthians 13:5, Paul exhorts the audience to self-examination concerning their covenant faithfulness, and closely follows the injunction with an intercessory prayer report. While the remarks in verses 5b and 10 give some indication that the passage is framed by the Christ-narrative, the evidence that the intercessory report is an emergent blend of that narrative may not be obvious. Additional evidence is the blend in 2 Cor 4:10–11 which maps the death and resurrection of Jesus onto the continual activity involved in Paul’s ministry as a typological manifestation those events. In the immediate context of that blend, Paul makes the strong claim in 4:12 that his sufferings confer salvation to his audience inasmuch as the death of Christ conferred salvation to him. Therefore, Paul understood the execution of his mission not as an analogy of Jesus’ death and resurrection, but as an embodied manifestation of the covenant power active in both. Without careful consideration, the concept in 2 Cor 13:1–10 that can be overlooked is that Paul considered the life of every covenant participant to be an embodied manifestation of that same power.

Obviously, these conclusions match Michael Gorman’s seminal work *Cruciformity: Paul’s Narrative Spirituality of the Cross*. In his reading, Paul’s narrative repeatedly impresses upon the audience that the term “the Lord Jesus” signifies the divine initiative in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Gorman writes, “To affirm and experience this Lord is therefore to be privileged to participate in a similar narrative of death followed by resurrection, of humiliation followed by exaltation.” So much so that “Paul finds the narrative death-resurrection and humiliation-exaltation patterns of Christ to be paradigmatic for his own life and that of his communities.” Gorman even describes it in CBT-like terms: “His death and subsequent exaltation by God have created a ‘new map of time’ in the believer’s symbolic universe, a map that must be replicated in the map of life time of each follower.”

---

time in the sensorimotor experience of Paul and other covenant participants as an ontological replacement, and not a remapping of a symbolic universe.

The point here is that the images of the death and resurrection of Jesus are partially mapped throughout 2 Cor 13:3–10. This is obvious by the direct reference in 13:4a—καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ—which is the image that governs the entire passage. Rather than detailing what punishment he would mete out or giving specific proofs to validate his position as the mouthpiece of God, Paul simply asserts the fact of his resurrection power—ζήσομεν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ εἰς ύμᾶς (13:3). The previous weakness is a blend that partially maps the crucifixion and the weakness with which he has been accused. This blend exploits the dissonance between the two concepts of weakness to highlight the superiority of the cross against the inferior accusations.

Therefore, the comment ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκετε ἐαυτούς ὅτι Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν ύμῖν (13:5b) is Paul’s maps the lives of the Corinthians into the embodied resurrection of Jesus as the eternal ethical presence which is emerging in their sensorimotor perception. The goal of the self-examination is to reinforce the concept that embodied covenant participation must manifest this power. As in the earlier discussion, the specific physical anchors of the self-evaluation are ignored in the blended space. The concept that the knowledge concerning sufficient embodied covenant participation is readily accessible necessitates a comment on 13:6 here, even though the detailed explanation is in the next chapter.

Paul’s remark, ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἀδόκιμοι should not be understood to signify his desire for a future change in the audience’s opinion based upon acquiring some new knowledge. This is the intimation, for example, of the NRSVA translation, “I hope that you will find out that we have not failed.” While it is true that γνώσεσθε has a future morphology, the emotive operator of ἐλπίζω is optative, and the adversativity of δὲ is important. Thus, the translations should read, “Yet, I would hope (expect) that you know we have not failed.” This connects the potential failure of the audience to the potential failure of Paul’s missionary activity among them by compressing the identity of the audience with the identity of the Pauline missionaries in the blended space represented by ἡμεῖς. Therefore, the δὲ in 13:7 carries the force, “Nevertheless, we pray etc.”

53 See the discussion of the adversative force of δὲ in 8.4.
The image evoked by the phrases οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς δόκιμοι φανῶμεν and ἡμεῖς δὲ ως ἀδόκιμοι ὤμεν map the necessity of the public nature of the crucifixion of Jesus and the covenant requirement of public confession of its power. Both Paul’s claim to boast only in the cross of Christ and his refusal to do anything that might drain it of its power are active in the present image and emerge with more specificity in the image elicited by χαίρομεν γὰρ ὅταν ἡμεῖς ἀσθενῶμεν.

What could go unnoticed is that the crucifixion imagery must necessarily situate the ethical connotations of μὴ ποιῆσαι κακὸν μηδὲν/ τὸ καλὸν ποίησε within the framework of the resurrection. Again, the specific physical anchors are not mapped. Like the development of the crucifixion imagery, the resurrection emerges more clearly with the phrase ύμεῖς δὲ δυνατοὶ ἦτε. Yet, its emergence climaxes in the direct prayer report in verse 9b: τοῦτο καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ύμων κατάρτισιν. Just like mutual physical presence was a partial experience and an anticipation of the parousia, the κατάρτισις that emerges from μὴ ποιῆσαι κακὸν μηδὲν/ τὸ καλὸν ποίησε is a partial experience and an anticipation of the bodily resurrection promised to covenant participants as the coordinate event in the teleological schema. Therefore, it is imperative to understand the protective and redemptive intentions that motivated Paul’s intercessory report in 2 Cor 13:7–9. Whatever measure of rebuke it contains is out measured by his intense desire for the Corinthians to experience the continual state of covenant participation described in the petitionary thanksgiving of the first letter.

6.3) Conclusion

David Pao considers Paul’s thanksgiving as a covenantal act.54 This chapter illustrated that, regardless of epistolary position, Paul’s prayer reports functioned as covenantal mnemonic narratives which used the mimetic properties of memory as the context for both thanksgiving and petition. Even though this practice was part of the 2T Jewish structure retained in Paul’s mission, expanding the analysis of the prayer reports beyond the typical formal limits revealed that the emergent complexity of Paul’s use of prayer and remembrance was proportional to the cosmic categorical metamorphosis described by the Christ-narrative. Like Deuteronomy, the Christ-narrative created the hermeneutical space which it subsequently inhabited.

54 David W. Pao, Thanksgiving: An investigation of a Pauline Theme, NSBT 13 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002).
The distinct complexity of the reports emerged because they were mnemonic narratives which compressed the identities of Paul, his audience, and the resurrected Jesus so that Christ-covenant participation became the defining emergent property of human existence. Prayer reports were critical to Paul’s mission because they created the impression of direct access to the physical presence of Paul and the resurrected Christ, and increased the anticipation of the telic human scale scenario in which the physical presence of Jesus manifested the eternal physical life of those who believe. Until that emergence was complete, the prayer reports oriented Paul’s audiences to the significance that their person and behaviour manifested the emerging ontology. In sum, Paul’s prayer reports affirm Ostmeyer’s assessment that, as participation in the Christ-covenant, prayer is necessarily an embodied sensorimotor process (Hinwendung zu Gott) of entering den Kommunikationsraum mit Gott und Christus.
Chapter 7) The Emergent Complexity of Certainty in Paul’s Wish Prayers

Chapter six concluded that Paul’s prayer reports created the impression of direct access to his physical presence, the presence of the resurrected Christ, and the emergence of the physical manifestation of the telic human scale scenario of the Christ-covenant. Even as indirect prayer language, Paul’s prayer reports affirm Ostmeyer’s conclusion that prayer is an embodied act of entering den Kommunikationsraum mit Gott und Christus. Chapters seven and eight analyse Paul’s audience blessings and doxologies as direct prayer language per Ostmeyer’s assertion, “Der Zutritt zu der Segensphäre Gottes und damit die Möglichkeit, Segen zu empfangen und selbst zu spenden, wird durch Christus eröffnet.” ¹

The first section in this chapter describes the prototypical blended space for blessing prayer blend, which is also utilised in chapter eight. Due to the pervasive opinion that non-indicative moods, particularly the optative, suggest a less than confident utterance, the remainder of this chapter analyses Paul’s prayers that feature a verb with optative morphology, commonly called wish-prayers. The second section presents the problems with this conventional understanding of optativity. The third section presents the alternative embodied concept of optativity. The fourth section describes the certainty which emerges from Paul’s optative prayers as a function of the execution of his mission.

7.1) Prototypical Blessing Blends

The prototypical BLESSING does not provide an exact representation of the world, but strengthens the relationship between observable events and a specific narrative through a positive embodiment of the prototypes inherent to that narrative. The DIALOGUE organising frame empowers the human agent to employ divine agency to affect a positive state. However, blessings are not the polar force to curses because blessings are not necessarily built on binary opposites which create and maintain boundaries. Counterfactual thinking can identify an adverse condition which a blessing can correct, but an actual counterfactual scenario is not necessary. For example, receiving a peace blessing does not entail a lack of peace. The TRANSACTION organising frame transfers tangible and non-tangible assets from the divine agent to the human recipient. Non-tangible assets are typically conceived as substantive properties which convey a sensorimotor transformation (e.g. I have hope, joy, peace, etc.). The human scale scenario in the prototypical blessing also has procedural markers for evaluating the self-

¹ Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 55.
involvement of the human agent. In Paul’s optative prayers, the main issue concerning his self-involvement is certainty.

7.2) Paul at the Wishing Well: Optative Morphology and Hermeneutic Uncertainty

The fundamental question is whether an optative verb inherently invests Paul’s prayers with less certainty? The question is significant because, as discussed in the next chapter, many of Paul’s blessings do not contain a lexical verb, which requires the audience to infer the intended “mood.” This issue even extends to the interpretation of curses discussed in chapter nine. This section shows the hermeneutic confusion and uncertainty created by the conventional understanding of the NT Koine Greek optative morphology.

Most NT Greek grammars simply state that, in Koine, the subjunctive mood replaced the optative mood in potential constructions, and the indicative and imperative moods overtook the optative in constructions where classical Greek used the optative form. A 2010 statistical analysis of optative verbs per 100 pages gives a good perspective of the decline in usage over time: Xenophon–330, Plato–250, Strabo–76, Philo–66, Polybius–37. Because the optative morphology appears less than seventy times in the NT, it is easy to understand why Moulton says that it “makes so poor a figure … that we are tempted to hurry on.” There are two reasons to resist this temptation.

First, all the suggested reasons for this change are unsatisfactory. Wallace surmises that, “Once Greek became a second language and expanded well beyond the borders of its native homeland, the subtleties of the language tended to drop out.” In Robertson’s

---

2 The term lexically present (lexicalized) is a linguistic term signifying the written or spoken form of a word. The idea is that verbal presence cannot be omitted, so it is inaccurate to say a verb is assumed. A verb is always actualized by an utterance. The issue is whether it is actualized by a lexical representation which fits the category of verb, or by other lexical items that do not.


opinion, “The optative was a luxury of the language and was probably never common in
the vernacular.”9 Porter’s suggestion is that, “The form probably was curtailed because
speakers felt that they could do the same thing the optative did by using the subjunctive,
but without having to worry about the rather awkward paradigm (the subjunctive was
probably much easier to remember).”10

Each proposition fails because language is presented as an objective entity, independent of
human use and perception. Language cannot lose subtly or nuance because it is a
derivative representation of thought. Obviously, second-language speakers might not use
all the available linguistic options, but, if anything, this reduction would increase subtly
and nuance. Even for native speakers, any detectable difference in language use relative to
genre and education is not criteria for determining common vernacular.11 As Robertson
says, “The N. T. Greek is … not an abnormal excrescence, but a natural development in
the Greek language…. It was not outside of the world-language, but in the very heart of it
and influenced considerably the future of the Greek tongue.”12 Hence, drawn from a wider
data set, Hansjakob Seiler’s observation merits attention:

considering just the modal forms and not the total modal expressions, we would
rather have expected the optative to survive. In the development of Greek from
Homer onward, the optative first made substantial gains in territory, as can be seen
from an inspection of Attic. In the Germanic languages, the inherited optative
proved to be the survivor, and the so-called subjunctive forms in Latin are at least
in part inherited optatives.13

The second reason not to hurry past the optative is that approximately half of the optative
verbs appear in the Pauline corpus, and mainly occur in prayer language.14 Because the
conventional approach to the Koine optative morphology invests it with an inherent
uncertainty (which is assumed to be a valid deduction from classical Greek usage),

---

9 Robertson, Grammar, 935–936.
10 Porter, Idioms, 59.
11 Contra Georg Walser, “The Greek language of antiquity was characterized by a sort of diglossia, or rather,
polyglossia, which meant not only that there was a marked distinction between everyday vernacular and
literary language, but also that different literary genres used their own varieties of the language,” The Greek
of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha, and the New
Testament, SGLL 8 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001), 1.
12 Robertson, Grammar, 30.
14 The LOGOS search function used for this project indicates that the Pauline corpus contains at least 31 of
the NT optatives, but textual variants could approximate 35. The issue would be greatly reduced, although
not unimportant, if the NT use of optative verbs were limited to indirect discourse.
exegetes are compelled to produce creative hermeneutics that rescue NT prayer language from the spectre of doubt. The following comment by Wallace exemplifies this process:

The voluntative optative… in the language of prayer… is largely a carry-over from Attic even though its meaning has changed. This is not due to any substantive change in syntax, but is rather due to a change in theological perspective. Prayers offered to the semi-gods of ancient Athens could expect to be haggled over, rebuffed, and left unanswered. But the God of the NT was bigger than that. The prayers offered to him depend on his sovereignty and goodness. Thus, although the form of much prayer language in the NT has the tinge of remote possibility, when it is offered to the God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead, its meaning often moves into the realm of expectation. If uncertainty is part of the package, it is not due to questions of God’s ability, but simply to the petitioner’s humility before the transcendent one.¹⁵

Even without logical leaps contrasting NT optative prayers with their Graeco-Roman counterparts, generative morphology creates hermeneutic confusion. Moule insists that Paul’s prayers which omit the verb must be understood as indicative rather than optative or imperative.¹⁶ However, Wiles argues that introductory blessings which omit the verb should be understood as either optative or imperative because the future indicative and optative forms are interchangeable in certain uses, especially when representing the Hebrew jussive form. “Even if the unexpressed verb in the Pauline blessings should be taken as indicative, this would by no means necessarily imply a merely flat statement… thereby implying a confident wish.”¹⁷ Yet, Wiles’ corrective is incomplete because he retains the idea that morphology has primitive meaning.¹⁸ The indicative mood is not primitively “flat.” Moreover, a “confident wish” is self-contradictory and does little to mitigate any perceived uncertainty in Paul’s prayers.

The confusion is amplified by Wiles’ oft-quoted distinction between the intercessory impact of wish prayers versus curses and pronouncement blessings: “But the very certainty of these pronouncements sets them also somewhat apart from the less assertive wish-prayers.”¹⁹ Even though Wiles never explicitly states why he perceived uncertainty,

¹⁵ Wallace, Grammar, 481. Though this argument may be attractive from an apologetic position, it is unduly religio-centric and historically untenable. See 4.1 above and Harland, Associations, 89–114.

¹⁶ Moule, Worship, 78–79.

¹⁷ Wiles, Prayers, 35–36.

¹⁸ Wiles’ arguments represent a modified generative understanding, illustrated by Seiler, “Abstract Structures,” 80. The optative and subjunctive moods have “always had two basic and irreducible meanings, volitional (volitive) and prospective.”

¹⁹ Wiles, Prayers, 134.
his emphasis on the optative mood as a formal structural characteristic for identifying wish-prayers gives the impression that it is centred on optative morphology.\textsuperscript{20} Note his comment on Gal 1:8:

Unlike the large element of uncertainty found in the intercessory wish-prayers, where he does not claim to know the designs of God in detail, there is shown in this curse the fullest assurance, in that he is defining his church members against particular enemies of the gospel who would destroy it from within.\textsuperscript{21}

Notwithstanding the agreement between Wiles’ assessment of Paul’s curses and the analysis in chapter nine, two correctives are necessary. First, there is a substantial difference between arguing for the introductory blessings as confident wishes and saying that the wish-prayers reflect a large element of uncertainty. Second, this conflict weakens, if not undermines, his argument concerning the confidence of curses and so-called pronouncement blessings. The certainty engendered by all three forms of prayer expression are equally dependent upon Paul’s confidence in the Christ-narrative. It is simply inconceivable that Paul was more confident invoking a curse than bestowing a blessing since both involve invoking the same God within the same blended mental space.

7.3) The Emergence of Semantic Optativity and Hermeneutic Certainty

Defining verbal modality is considered one of the most troublesome tasks in linguistics.\textsuperscript{22} The most that can be said about morphology is that certain forms appear to be more commonly used in certain contexts to express particular attitudes.\textsuperscript{23} Thus, verbal modality is best understood as an emergent property at the interface of human interaction which represents something of the attitude of the participants, even when modal forms are entrenched functions of a complex adaptive linguistic system. Like ἵνα and ὅτι, modal forms are procedural markers that help inform the audience’s perception of the perspective of the speaker.\textsuperscript{24} As Sim points out, “Authorial choice is not merely a matter of style, but

\textsuperscript{20} Wiles, \textit{Prayers}, 32–33; 35–36.
\textsuperscript{21} Wiles, \textit{Prayers}, 121.
\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Porter, \textit{Idioms}, 28, “Choice of a verbal aspect is seen to lie at the discretion of the speaker or writer, within certain well-established patterns of usage.”
\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Sim, \textit{Marking Thought}, 198, “Although its function is to give procedural instructions, its actual ‘meaning’, or rather translation, will differ according to the logical relation of the clause it introduces to the rest of the sentence and beyond.”
invites the reader to draw inferences from the use of a particular grammatical form.”

Yet, as functions of complex adaptive linguistic systems, modal morphologies, however deeply entrenched, never become independent prescriptive forces apart from human intention.

Indebted primarily to the work of Patrick Grosz, this study defines the term *optativity* as the human attitude of desire, and regards the *optative mood* as the most common linguistic representation of optativity in a given language. Grosz analysed modern English and German for what he called semantic optativity: utterances which “express a wish, hope or desire without an overt lexical item that means *wish, regret, hope or desire.*” In other words, he looked for optativity in sentences that did not contain the optative mood. His work is pertinent because he used a comparative methodology that included Ancient Greek, as well as Albanian and Romanian. In each language, semantic optativity did not “consistently correlate with any obvious feature of optative clauses.” Rather, semantic optativity revealed the speaker’s preferences via “an expressive element that shifts descriptive content into the domain of expressive content.” Any verbal morphology could potentially be exploited to express optativity, regardless of the entrainment of a particular form in a given language in a particular era. The key is identifying the “expressive element” in a way that is not atomistic or mechanical.

Grosz proposed three expressive properties for identifying the emergence of semantic optativity in a particular utterance:

1) *descriptive ineffability:* “We are hard-pressed to say what optative utterances mean. We know that they express a wish or at least a positive evaluation, but … this observation alone does not equip us with an understanding.”

2) *immediacy:* “uttering them alone is sufficient to fulfil one’s communicative goal.”

---

25 Sim, *Marking Thought*, 81. In agreement with this study, she continues, “I do not suggest that this is necessarily a conscious process: that is, I do not visualize the author consciously selecting one option as against another, but as having in mind the communicative effect which he wants his utterance to have on his readers.”


3) **repeatability**: “expressive meaning is strengthened under repetition.”

There is definite affinity between these properties and the linguistic principles used in this study. Descriptive ineffability is related to both top-down processing and the underdetermination of language in that the initial perception of verbal modality is direct access and global insight into both the content of the utterance and the intentions of the speaker. This is true of any modality, so that subjunctive utterances give the general impression of potentiality, indicative the impression of factuality, imperative the impression of command. However, the initial impressions presented by modality have limited cognitive value because meaning is not localised, even in morphology, but distributed across the entire interface of human interaction.

Immediacy is related to the cognitive linguistic principles that grammar is conceptualisation and the main function of language is to communicate experience. According to Grosz, “none of the functions associated with [optative utterances] are non-emotional and non-evaluative,” and are always non-truth-conditional.

Repeatability means that optativity requires an emotive operator that shifts the “argument from the level of descriptive at-issue content to the level of expressive content.” The emotive operator “conveys that the denoted proposition has a particular rank on a relevant scale” which is proportionate to the desire of the speaker. What follows these operators is expressive content that is high on a relative scale from the perspective of the speaker.

Repeatability is a double-edged blade for the significance of optative morphology. As a procedural indicator, the higher frequency of the optative form in classical Greek provides a larger data set for describing a wide and multi-nuanced range of emotive and evaluative representation. However, the decline in use only signifies a narrowing of the representative range for the morphology, not how or why the range of representation was limited. The fact that the morphology continued to represent certain evaluative scenarios explicitly prohibits, rather than justifies, summary judgment on the emotive or evaluative

---

32 Grosz, “Optative Constructions,” 163. In his analysis of English, Grosz cites ‘only’ and ‘if only’ as examples.
force of an individual occurrence. Therefore, NT optatives may require more, not less, attention than classical optatives.

Grosz’ findings are significant evidence that semantic optativity emerges through language use via conceptual blending. His study also illustrates that a morphological modal shift is a phase change in a complex adaptive linguistic system which cannot be explained, but only described as an ontogenetic phenomenon. Most important for the interpretation of Paul’s prayers, his study shows that verbal modality is unaffected by morphological bifurcations because the emotive indicators of modality and scale will always be present in language. This is the hermeneutic certainty afforded by understanding optativity as an emergent property of language use.

The next section shows that the degree of certainty in Paul’s optative prayers is an emergent property distributed across three emotive scaled indicators which are only partially informed by morphology: 1) The degree to which the identity of the issuer is compressed with the identity of either the divine agent or the audience, 2) The degree of space compression that signifies the availability of the divine agent, and 3) The degree of time compression that signifies the willingness of the divine agent.

7.4) The Emergence of Scaled Semantic Optativity and Certainty in Paul’s Wish-Prayers

This section describes the emotive and evaluative scale of certainty in Paul’s wish-prayers by considering the emergent functions of the divine agency identity compressions, the implied motion in the prayer, and the desired outcomes. Romans 16:20a, Philippians 4:19, and 1 Thessalonians 5:24 are included because of textual variants with optative

---

34 Contra Wallace, “When one morpho-syntactic feature is becoming absorbed by another in Hellenistic Greek and when a Hellenistic author uses the rarer form, he normally does so consciously and with understanding. What this means in that the absorption moves in one direction only. A Hellenistic author may use a subjunctive while in classical Greek an optative would have been used. But a Hellenistic author will not use an optative in a situation which, in the classical era, required a subjunctive,” Grammar, 480. Emphasis his.

35 Ontogenesis is change over time. Tomasello, “in contrast to generative grammar and other formal approaches, in usage based approaches the grammatical dimension of language is a product of a set of historical and ontogenetic processes referred to collectively as grammaticalization,” Constructing, 5. For examples of ontogenesis in nouns, see Robert P. Stockwell and Donka Minkova, English Words: History and Structure (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 34. “Since the Vikings spoke a Germanic language, sharing words with Old English, but pronouncing them differently, we find that one and the same word with two pronunciations, Scandinavian and Old English, has evolved into a pair of historically related words which are now two separate lexical items. Such pairs in present-day English are dike vs. ditch, scrub vs. shrub, skirt vs. shirt.”
morphology. The complexity of the analysis is aided by the following reference table of the texts under discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paul's Optative Prayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rom 15:5–6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ύπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δόθη ύμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὅ νομοθεματίδαν ἐν ἐνι στόματι δουλήσατε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Rom 15:13** |
| ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ύμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ύμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἀγίου. |

| **Rom 16:20a** |
| ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης συντρίψει τὸν σατανὰν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. |

| **1 Thess 3:11** |
| Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς |

| **1 Thess 3:12–13** |
| 12 ύμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς ύμᾶς, 13 εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ύμῶν τὰς χαρὰς ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἀγαπώσῃ ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, [ἀμὴν]. |

| **1 Thess 5:23–24** |
| 23 Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγάπασαι ύμᾶς ὑπερελεῖσαι, καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς χριστοῦ τηρηθείη. 24 πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ύμᾶς, ὥς καὶ ποιήσει. |

| **Phil 4:19** |
| ὁ δὲ θεὸς μου πληρώσει πᾶσαν χρείαν ύμῶν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ ἐν δόξῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. |

---

36 Rom 16:20a (A pc it vg⁶), Phil 4:19 (D* F G), 1 Thess 5:24 (F). Due to the ontogenetic reduction of the morphology, it is interesting to consider the optative as original, and what potential sensorimotor factors may have contributed to the emergence of the future indicative.
A) Scaled Certainty in Divine Agent Identity Compression

The divine agent invoked in prayer is a procedural marker that meets Grosz’ three properties of semantic optativity. This is easily seen in the multiplicity and regionalisation of Gentile deities. For example, a desire for safe sea travel was associated with Pan in Egypt and the goddess Artemis was revered for making Ephesus a famous city.37 Obviously, the monotheism associated with the Torah-θεός precluded limiting divine agency to any contingent circumstance. Yet, except for 1 Thess 3:12, Paul augments his initial identification of θεός to create a unique SOURCE—the God of X—for the localised purpose of the prayer. Embodied cognition also precludes describing Paul’s divine identity compressions as a simple transposition of his Jewish tradition. Something about the contingent circumstance evoked each blessing. The identity compressions elicit the DIVINE ORIGIN schema so that the desired outcome flows naturally and necessarily into the domain of human perception via the self-involvement of the divine agent. From the perspective of the speaker, there is a significant difference between the utterances, “May God bless you,” and, “May the God of … bless you.” The latter phrase has a higher scale of certainty because the speaker expresses a more confident sense of global insight and direct access into the willingness of the divine agent. Such expression signifies that the speaker has a self-identity which has been compressed with the identity of the divine agent.

The blessings above illustrate, at least, four different compression strategies of selective and partial cross-mapping attribute relations to create a divine agent who is sufficiently suited for the prayer. In Rom 15:5–6, Rom 15:13, Rom 16:20, and 1 Thess 5:23–24, Paul employs the abstract attributes ὑπομονή and παράκλησις, ἐλπίς, and εἰρήνη to give the audience an impression of direct access and global insight into the divine agent. Parallel to Grosz’ research, it is significant to note that this process is not lexically dependent. For example, Rom 15:13 is the only blessing in which the abstract attribute of the source category is repeated in the desired outcome. However, the complexity of the motion and the outcome is well beyond the semantic field of the single attribute which forms the source category. Moreover, the source category in Rom 16:20a has a lexical dissonance with the desired outcome that does not necessarily result in cognitive dissonance (God of Peace/ crush). This does not mean that there cannot be cognitive dissonance between a source identity and a desired outcome that signifies an emergent uncertainty. The point is

37 See NewDocs, 3:113; 4:75.
that a blended identity is initially perceived as an integrated whole, which entails the initial perception of functional sufficiency and a relatively high scale of certainty from the perspective of the speaker. For Paul, these attributes were far from abstract, but were somehow grounded in his sensorimotor perception. Because these blessings are not just embedded in the epistolary context, but in the prototypical spaces which constructed Paul’s mission, the blend itself may not resolve how these attributes were evoked. If so, potential answers will emerge as the blend moves from the divine agent to the desired outcome.

A second strategy is evidenced in 1 Thess 3:11 and Phil 4:19 where the divine agent is compressed with the identity of specific persons. In Philippians, the source category \(\text{θεός μου}\) signifies a high degree of certainty because it places Paul and \(\text{θεός}\) in constant and direct communion. For the audience, this singularity creates a tight space compression in which direct access to God is proportional to their access to Paul. In 1 Thess 3:11, \(\pi\nu\tau\rho\ \eta\mu\omega\) places the community, including Paul, in a state of constant relational access to \(\text{θεός}\). The emphatic \(\text{Αὐτός}\) personifies \(\text{θεός}\) as a self-involved paterfamilias. Although, the self-involvement of \(\eta\mu\omega\) is not indicative of the audience’s scaled certainty, it suggests Paul’s high scale of expectancy that their certainty would, or should, match his own.

A third strategy for divine agency compression, also illustrated in 1 Thess 3:11, is the integration of the Christ-narrative into the divine agent identity. Even though, at the minimal threshold of network relevance, \(\delta \chi\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma\) does not necessarily represent Ιησούς as a divine agent, \(\kappa\alpha\iota\) and the 3S verb \(\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\theta\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\) create a singular agent in terms of Cause-Effect and Intentionality compression. The integrated unit \(\delta \chi\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma \eta\mu\omega\nu\) Ιησούς signifies divine agency in the blend because network relevance means that, all things being equal, it must represent sufficient authority to satisfy the principle of human scale. Even so, the individual integrated unity of the divine agents is never jeopardised. The identity compression \(\pi\tau\nu\rho\ \eta\mu\omega\nu\) places the identity of Ιησούς, Paul, and the audience into a singular relationship to \(\text{θεός}\) that maintains the humanity of Ιησούς without threatening his divine agency. The identity compression \(\chi\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma \eta\mu\omega\nu\) maintains the separation between \(\text{θεός}\) and Ιησούς as the divine agent, and Paul and the audience as human worshippers.

The advantage of analysing 1 Thess 3:12–13 as a self-contained blend is to illustrate a fourth strategy for divine agency compression. Rather than introducing a divine agent with sufficient specific identity, this blend manipulates input spaces for three divine agents with little immediate resolution for their relationship. In 3:12, \(\chi\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma\) is a nebulous divine referent invoked for the immediate request. Furthermore, the compressions of space...
(ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν) and time (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ) are mapped as effects inherent to κύριος as the singular cause! The emphatic point is that reading this prayer in an ever-widening context of the previous verse, the letter, the Pauline corpus, and the entire biblical corpus never resolves the referential ambiguity of κύριος, or the lexical dissonance in the blend, and yet neither the ambiguity, nor the lexical dissonance, necessarily create cognitive dissonance.38

It appears that the relationship created in 3:11 remains active in the blended space of 12–13 so that the perception of two unique agents in 3:13 prohibits overestimating either as the value for κύριος, and underestimating κύριος as less than a deity who must be contextualised by a narrative common to all three. This referential ambiguity for κύριος is a procedural marker that prompts the audience to the common narrative that frames the relationship between ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν and ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς. In this regard, the referential use of κύριος for the God of Israel in the LXX (or OT for English readers) locates the framing narrative within the broader context of Judaism. This has two significant implications for κύριος as the divine agent in 3:12–13. First, the scale of certainty is proportional to the certainty invested in the historic narrative, which previous chapters have presented as high. Second, the referential function reinforces the concept that the lexical appearance of multiple agents does not equate to the semantic appearance of the same. This reinforces the previous effect of κατευθύνει that the blended space contains the semantic presence of a single divine agent. Thus, the referential ambiguity of κύριος is essential to the cogency of the blend, and probably essential to the scaled certainty, because it represents the mental space in which the new complexities of Christianity were developed. Any attempt to resolve the tension is not only futile, but also hermeneutically counterproductive.39

In summary, the divine agency compressions in Paul’s blessings present a high level of semantic optativity as described by Grosz’ principles of descriptive ineffability and immediacy. The different augmentation strategies function as repetition within the blend which increases the expressive meaning of desire to a relatively high initial scale of

38 Fauconnier and Turner, *Conceptual Blending*, 370, “Language has elaborate formal patterns because it prompts for powerful blending schemes. But the formal patterns and blending schemes are so deeply entrenched as to be almost invisible to consciousness.” Anecdotal data collected in this research through personal conversations consistently confirmed this analysis. The data concerned English translations, but the referential ambiguity and lexical dissonance were judged to be unaffected by translation.

39 The fascinating thing is that this may be self-evident due to the natural process of human cognition.
certainty from Paul’s perspective. This optative certainty prompts the audiences to anticipate at least the same degree of certainty, if not an increase, as they integrate the implied motion into their own conceptual constructs.

B) Scaled Semantic Optativity in Caused-Motion

This section analyses the implied motion of Paul’s optative blessings as force-dynamic networks consisting of agent-action, object-motion, and direction towards a goal. The force exerted by the agent creates either an Access Path or an Advent Path for compressing the object-motion and direction into a human scale scenario. Access paths employ verbs which elicit potential or kinetic motion upon a trajectory that is amenable to sensorimotor perception to establish the most direct cause-effect link between the agent and the goal. Advent paths employ stative verbs that do not require a trajectory or inertia. This compression presents the effect as a state of the cause, even though the verb is a compression of discrete actions that are trajectory dependent. Fauconnier and Turner use the utterance, “They prayed the boys home,” as an example of an advent path blend.

Here the blend is performing an extreme compression: The scene… contains many causal steps over an expanse of time, and intermediate agents, with relatively weak or vague causality, but in the blend there is a single action that is directly causal for the boys’ coming home. 41

Based on the point at which it seems most natural to achieve human scale, the following analysis describes Rom 15:5, Rom 15:13, and Phil 4:19 in terms of access paths, and the blessings in 1 Thess and Rom 16:20a in terms of advent paths. However, the terms are limited since Paul’s blessings are far more complex than hypothetical examples. Some of the path designations could be described in the other term. Also, some of the blessings present qualities from both paths because of the cognitive and communicative dissonance inherent in the Christ-narrative. This issue arises particularly when the agent identity becomes fluid or the blend contains nested goals. Yet, part of the value of the analysis is to show Paul’s prayers as evidence that the two paths are neither monolithic, nor mutually exclusive. The main point is describing how access and advent paths serve as emotive elements that shift the prayers from the realm of descriptive content to that of expressive

40 Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 370–380, for the discussion of caused motion. The hyphenation is theirs.

41 Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 372.
Romans 15:5 is designated as an access path because the human scale scenario evoked by \( \delta \iota \sigma \omega \mu i \) is organised by a TRANSACTION frame which has a linear trajectory connecting the audience directly to the divine source. The sensorimotor perception of the space involved in the transaction is compressed to an arm’s length. The difficulty is that the gift has an implied advent path motion of continual dynamic integration—\( \tau \ ο \ αυτο \ φρονειν \ εν \ \alpha λλη\lambda o\iotaς \ \kappa \alpha τά \ Χριστόν \ \Ιησούν \). The resolution is described below in the discussion concerning Paul’s desired outcomes. The pertinent point here is to note the substantive character of the gift, and how it brings the more abstract ideas of buttressing weaker people and edifying neighbours into the purview of sensorimotor perception. In the blend, God moves close enough to the audience to hand them a gift which will empower them to fulfil the general ethics in specific circumstances. In this instance, \( υμίν \) signifies that the gift can be individually possessed and spatially distributed without jeopardising its power as an integrated unit. The emotive value of the trajectory is high because the gift, once given, is always close at hand. Any idea of uncertainty, which is also resolved below, arises due to the punctiliar aspect in the generic space TO GIVE.

In Rom 15:13 and Phil 4:19, the trajectory of \( \pi \lambda \rho ρ \varsigma \omega \) is also a linear TRANSACTION schema which uses 2P pronouns to create the impression of equipotential distribution of the request regarding time and space. However, the emotive value of the \( \pi \lambda \rho ρ \varsigma \omega \) trajectory is not mapped in terms of spatial proximity, but by an upward trajectory that maps the concept of filling a container. Geometrically, \( \pi \lambda \rho ρ \varsigma \omega \) is a vector and \( \delta \iota \sigma \omega \mu i \) is a segment. It is crucial to understand that these different trajectories have no comparative value, but are grounded in different sensorimotor perceptions.

Since conceptualisation is relative to the foregrounding of the immediate cause, it is possible to detect different scenarios for the \( \pi \lambda \rho ρ \varsigma \omega \) access path vector in Rom 15:13 and Phil 4:19. Although the scaled emotive value remains high in both, the blends could elicit different points of beginning that might affect the linguistic representation. As the apodosis of 4:18, Phil 4:19 contains the nested blend Need-As-Container. Since the generic space EMPTINESS is available as a point of beginning, the specific image schema of an empty container could have more naturally prompted the use of the future indicative. In Rom 15:13, the nested blend is Person-As-Container. Because it serves as the culmination
of the elaborate καθὼς γέγραπται blend which has already mapped the generic space FULL/COMPLETE/SUFFICIENT, the point of beginning for πληρῶ could be EQUITY framed by the historic narrative. In other words, the historic foregrounding of Rom 15:13 could more naturally elicits the optative form, “May God do the same now as in the past,” and the present foregrounding of Phil 4:19 could more naturally elicit, “And my God will do for you, now, as he is doing for me.”42

While this difference does not affect the emotive value of the trajectory, it does evidence the localised nature of emergent meaning and serve as an interpretive marker for the different ways in which embodied cognition shapes language. In both cases, the emotive value of the πληρῶ vector increases the optative certainty because the implied motion is grounded in the sensorimotor perception of God’s provision as an active function of his divine character. The tight space compressions create the sense of continuous direct access to God’s never-ending motion towards the audience. Any unresolved uncertainty is related to the tension between the ontology of the implied motion and the ontic sensorimotor experience. Even though this cannot be resolved until the audience integrates Paul’s desired outcome, the motion prompts them to anticipate a positive resolution.

(ii) The Emotive Value of Cause-Effect Compression in Advent Paths

Since advent paths express a state of being by compressing the intermediate action implied in the verb, the emotive value often occurs through apparently redundant augmentation. According to Fauconnier and Turner, people “have a standard way of using conceptual blends … [that] seem to increase the complexity of description gratuitously by involving superfluous dimensions and structures.”43 It is critical to understand that while such dimensions and structures may be lexically gratuitous and superfluous, they represent cognitive necessities from the perspective of the speaker’s conceptualization of the emotive value within the joint attentional frame of the communication.

The implied motion of ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὅλοτελεῖς in 1 Thess 5:23 is probably the easiest to describe as an advent path because there is no hint of trajectory, only appearance. This path is also pleonastic in that holiness/sanctification is a binary category which does not need the augmentation ὅλοτελεῖς. Merely stating that Paul added the term for emphasis

42 See “Scaled Certainty in the Felt-Need Prayers” below for the argument that the optative variant in Philippians is preferable.

43 Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual Blending, 376.
underestimates the potential that, without the augmentation, he would have perceived his thought to be understated. Instead, the adjective should be understood as a procedural marker for a high scale of semantic optativity.

In 1 Thess 3:12, the advent path is the divine presentation of the audience in a constant state of ever-increasing and ever-integrating love in the presence of those inside and outside of the community. Not only does this blend have a pleonastic point of beginning, it is augmented by the advent path καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, which also functions as the result of 3:11. The augmentation is a “meta-advent” path that creates a conceptual vortex of continual dynamic integration within Christ-covenant fellowship. Therefore, this advent path has an increased complexity in that the state presented has an implied emergent access path that expands as it integrates.

Describing the motion in 1 Thess 3:11 and Rom 16:20a as advent paths is increasingly more difficult because they are obviously grounded in sensorimotor perception which does evoke prototypical trajectories. However, in both cases, the emphasis seems to be a re-presentation of ontic experience based upon the Christ-covenant ontology. In 1 Thess 3:11, Paul could easily have written κατευθύναι ἡμᾶς πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Yet ὁδὸν ἡμῶν places the emphasis on the objects and circumstances which stand between them. The emphasis of the blend is not on how the intermediate struggles of travel are overcome or avoided, but on the appearance of a direct and carefree road between Paul and his audience. The advent path creates an access path to the divine power and intention to provide physical interpersonal interaction without denying the obvious separation.

In Rom 16:20a, συντρίψει … ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν is considered an advent path because the action is mediated between the divine agent and the goal via the audience. The emphasis does not appear to involve the downward trajectory or inertia of stomping feet, but upon presenting the typically foreboding threat nominalised by Σατανᾶς as innocuous dust. The prayer seems to be a re-presentation of ontic experience in which overcoming evil is a matter of course, and nothing more. It is easy enough to understand how the temporal modifier ἐν τάχει could influence a morphological shift from the optative to the future indicative. Yet, in the context of the previous statement—ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοή εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο ἄφικε τὸ ἁγαθὸν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ

44 Although the potential that Paul was aware of the cognitive effect of ὁδός is considered negligible, the possibility that it emerged in his conceptualization of the prayer because of this potential effect is considered quite high.
κακόν—it is not necessary for ἐν τάχει to map temporal lapsing. Instead, as an augmentation of the advent path, ἐν τάχει could be a procedural marker for Paul’s heightened semantic optativity that the ontology presented in the prayer would become the sensorimotor experience of the audience.

Regardless of how the implied motion in these blessings is described, they evidence Paul’s high level of desire for the audience to have a sensorimotor experience of the Christ-covenant ontology. In general, access paths tend to focus on the impression of direct contact with the divine agent, while advent paths tend to focus on the impression of global insight as a teleological dynamic state of continuous integration. Both paths create a tight space compression that increases the sense of certainty from Paul’s perspective. A complete evaluation of his scaled certainty requires examining the outcomes he so intently desired.

C) Paul’s Certainty in the Desired Outcomes as a Function of Emergent Complexity

For analytical purposes, the desired outcomes are divided between the organising frames FELT-NEED and PRESUMED-NEED. The prayers in 1 Thess 3:11, and Phil 4:19 approximate the prototypical pattern of an intercessory prayer that invokes a deity due to a felt need. The prayers in Rom 15:5–6, Rom 15:13, 1 Thess 3:12–13, and 1 Thess 5:23–24 presume needs upon the audience without mapping the audience’s actual awareness of the need into the blend. The blessing in Rom16:20a could be described either way. The following description shows that Paul invested certainty in all the blessings through sensorimotor connections to the Christ-narrative.

(i) Scaled Certainty in the Felt-Need Prayers

In terms of FELT-NEED, 1 Thess 3:11 is most obvious. The fact that Paul construed his presence in the community as a divine blessing confirms the argument in the previous chapter that Paul’s physical presence was significant to fulfilling whatever was lacking in their faith. The point here is that neither morphology nor Paul’s reference in 1 Thess 2:18 to similar repeated prayers which did not result in the desired outcome are sufficient evidence to invest *κατευθύνα* with uncertainty. If anything, the mention of repeated prayers intensifies the scale of desire and certainty with which Paul prayed. Regardless of the change in circumstance, he claimed to pray unceasingly in the same direction. By understanding Paul’s sensorimotor experience of the resurrected Jesus as the impetus for his mission, the divine agent collocation does more than proclaim the divinity of Jesus. It functions as a mnemonic for the ongoing dynamic power of the resurrection to replace the
ontic human experience with the emerging life-structured ontology (cf. 1 Thess 1:10). Paul’s certainty in the advent of his blessing is directly proportional to his certainty that he perceived the resurrected Jesus.

Although, the desired result in Phil 4:19 does not necessitate a felt-need, the universal human experience of need and embodied cognition make it probable that some specific circumstances prompted this blessing. Here, the phrase κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ ἐν δόξῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ reveals Paul’s scaled certainty in the blessing by representing the divine wealth with a circumlocution for the resurrection of Jesus. In Phil 3:20–21, δόξα frames the telic event of the parousia as the fulfilment of every physical need. The point of the blessing in 4:19 is that ontic access to the emerging ontology is more available than present sensorimotor experience would suggest.

Even though, this high level of certainty is unaffected by verbal morphology, in this case, it seems that the future indicative may slightly obscure the function of the blessing.

Pursuant to the previous chapter, Phil 4:10–20 is Paul’s prayer report on behalf of the Philippians upon the arrival of Epaphroditus. The recounting of the Philippians past deeds places the current gift in a continuous narrative which Paul conceived as evidence of the emerging Christological ontology. From this perspective, Phil 4:19 parallels Rom 15:13 as the culmination of an integrative narrative so that the prototypical point of beginning is EQUITY, for which the optative morphology may be more natural. Although the gift is the focus of the joint attentional frame since it signified the Philippians’ revived concern for Paul, it still functions metonymically for the physical telic emergence of Christ-covenant solidarity. Some other action could have elicited the same response. Regardless of the morphology, Paul’s emphasis is that the present ontic accessibility of the life-structured ontology is greater than what the Philippians may understand, as well as the potency of their behaviour as a present manifestation of that ontology.

(ii) Scaled Certainty in Presumed-Need Prayers

This section examines Paul’s optative blessings which appear to presume needs upon the audience without mapping the audience’s actual awareness of the need. Therefore, the hermeneutical significance of the desired outcomes is determined by how they are framed by the Christ-narrative. This analysis describes the potential that the prayers express Paul’s desire for the audience to gain a broader understanding of the present accessibility of the life-structured Christ-covenant.
In Rom 15:5, the morphology of δῴη obscures the prototypical punctiliar aspect of GIVE so that the emphasis is the access to the advent path κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. As discussed previously, the ἑν in 15:6 is a procedural marker for the content of Paul’s actual prayer on behalf of the Romans. The particle signifies much more than a logical propositional result. It reveals Paul’s mental construction of the sensorimotor activity in the Roman community that would equate to a physical manifestation of the Christ-covenant. Paul’s desire is for the Roman community to maintain the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus as their conceptual point of reference for worship and interpersonal behavior. Unless glorifying God is grounded in the physicality of the Christ-narrative, it cannot be integrated into daily sensorimotor behavior, and is relegated to abstract propositional reasoning which inevitably breeds confusion and contention. Therefore, the purpose is not behavioural conformity, but semantic solidarity in the divine empowerment of covenant participation.

The relationship between Rom 15:13 and 15:7–12 has been discussed in some detail. Describing the desired outcome requires considering 15:14–21. In verse 14, Paul follows the prayer with a declaration of confidence in the character and ability of the Roman community. Even so, he boldly reminds them of the greater implications concerning their responsibility by using his own activities as an example. Therefore, the prayer in 15:13 is an exemplar for their participation in the emerging life-structured ontology which integrates everyone who acknowledges its existence. Paul’s point is that εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν and τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου are not principally attitudes, but motivations for behaviour that defies the ontology of death and manifests the ontology of life. As much as the Romans are already doing so, Paul believes that there is much more that they have yet to actualise.

From a communicative perspective, the desired outcome in 1 Thess 3:12–13 and 5:23–24 is to focus the joint attentional frame on the parousia of Jesus as the teleology for manifesting behaviour that proclaims the ontology of eternal physical life. In the first case, the dynamic force of the love vortex has the direct effect of strengthening the audience’s expectation of the event, which Paul believes will increase their behavioural manifestation of it. The final phrase, μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, counteracts any sense of isolation that the Thessalonian community may be experiencing. This is a significant part of the new possibilities which delineate the complexity distinct to Paul’s mission as the Apostle to the Gentiles. Again, the emphasis is not on the parousia as a static event, but the emerging motion which integrates and preserves life by excluding death from the ontic realm of possibility.
Similarly, the blessing in 5:23–24 is connected to 12–22 as an illustration of the instructions in 4:18 (‘Ὦστε παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις) and 5:11 ( Διὸ παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἕνα, καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε). Both directives concern using the parousia narrative as the conceptual focus for worship, behavior, and instruction. Therefore, 5:12–24 is an integrated unit that compresses the present embodied covenant participation of the audience with the telic event of the parousia. The optative morphology of τηρηθείη emerges as the procedural marker for the singular divine action and Paul’s desire for the audience to integrate the telic event and their present behaviour. It is proposed that the intensity of the emotive value prompted the additional comment πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὡς καὶ ποιήσει, and not a felt need to compensate for uncertainty inherent in optative morphology of τηρηθείη. Most likely, the sensorimotor experience of linear time ultimately influenced the shift from the optative to the future indicative. However, here the optative variant is the preferred reading because it augments the optative element that shifts the content from descriptive at-issue content to emotive evaluation. The intent is not to describe or predict when the teleological event will happen, but to emphasis the potential for present sensorimotor experience made available by the inevitability of the event.

As stated above, the blessing in Rom 16:20a, could be described as either a felt-need or a presumed-need. The directive to beware of people who create strife and dissension would not make sense unless the audience had some sensorimotor conception of such things. However, if Paul’s remark in verse 19 is understood to be a genuine sentiment, then ἐφ’ ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σοφοὺς εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἄγαθον, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν constitutes a prayer report which includes 16:20a. Therefore, the optative reading is preferred because the desired outcome of the prayer is independent of any active divisiveness. The identity θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης is not invoked as the antithesis of war or strife, but as the antithetical ontology which permanently excises all negativity in the human experience. The point is that obedient covenant participation, no matter how strong, is not the end goal, though it is necessary. As part of a complex adaptive system, obedience has a teleological order of growth which is constantly manifesting and being manifested by the emerging life-structured ontology. Paul’s prayer is for the immediate physical manifestation of the telic event so that the implications of the resurrection become explicit within the ontic realm.
7.5) Conclusion

This chapter showed that optativity denotes the prototypical human attitude of desire which can be, but is not necessarily, signified by the Greek optative morphology. The analysis does not conclude that optative morphology is insignificant. Nor does it deny, or even evaluate, that the optative form in classical Greek signified emotive values that did not emerge in Koine. The point is that the non-autonomy of language and the equipotential distribution of emergent meaning in complex systems means that the scaled values of optative certainty and desire are not atomistic values which can be solely determined by any morphological form in any era.

In Paul’s prayers, the optative morphology is a significant emotive procedural operator that shifts the prayers from descriptive at-issue content to expressive content. As such, Paul’s optative prayers are not less-than-certain wishes for his audiences, but blessings invested with a high scale of certainty in his sensorimotor perception of the risen Jesus and an intense emotive desire for the sensorimotor implications of that event to be actualised in the ontic realm of human experience. Because the optative prayers focus the audiences’ attention on the parousia as the telic event that represented the complete emergence of the life-structured ontology, they are cognitive blends for living in the Christ-covenant that approximate an unlimited scale for experiencing the ‘already’ which are intended to increase the desire for the ontology which has ‘not yet’ fully emerged. Therefore, the element of ‘wish’ is best understood as Paul’s desire for his audiences to take full advantage of the new potentials and possibilities afforded them by the Christ-covenant.
Chapter 8) The Emergent Complexity of Paul’s Blessings and Doxologies

Chapter seven concluded that Paul’s optative prayers emerged from his high scale of certainty in the Christ-narrative and his intense desire for his audiences to understand and experience the new ontic possibilities, potentials, and responsibilities presented by the Christ-covenant. This chapter addresses the emergent complexity of Paul’s audience blessings and divine doxologies which are not included in the wish-prayer typology. As discussed in 7.1, these prayers do not provide an exact representation of the world, but function to strengthen the relationship between observable events and the Christ-narrative by providing a positive embodiment of that narrative.

Section 4.2B acknowledged the existence of a generic reciprocity schema in the ancient world, but argued that it was possible to delineate between a teleological reciprocity and a mechanical reciprocity. Section 5.4 acknowledged that Graeco-Roman religion is too often caricatured, but maintained that the necessary nuance does not negate Harder’s distinction between the function of Jewish and Gentile religion in the first century. Therefore, the first section brings these issues together to assess how Paul’s categorical metamorphosis of being human contextualised the reciprocity schema in Paul’s blessings and doxologies.

The second section describes the emergence of Christ-covenant solidarity in Paul’s prayer-greetings and farewell-blessings per Ostmeyer’s description, “Durch das Zusprechen der χάρις werden deren Adressaten mit in diese Sphäre hineingenommen und ihre gemeinsame Teilhabe an der Gnade bekräftigt…. Durch den χάρις-Zuspruch ist die Gemeinde in die durch Christus ermöglichte Gnadsphäre hineingenommen.”1 The third section. The second section proposes the coexistence of solidarity and conditionality in 2 Cor 13:11, Gal 6:16, Phil 4:7, and Phil 4:9. The fourth section describes Paul’s doxologies as emergent functions of the epistemic availability of the Christ-covenant per Ostmeyer’s opinion that Paul’s preaching opened access to the “Sphäre der δόξα Gottes.” 2

8.1) Reciprocity and Category Metamorphosis in Paul’s Blessings and Doxologies

Adolf Deissmann’s characterisation of Graeco-Roman religion as “a business transaction, do ut des, between man and a fetish,”3 continues to inspire the idea Paul’s χάρις-language

---

1 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 60–61.
2 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 78.
was a direct critique of the Graeco-Roman beneficiary system of reciprocity which
governed interpersonal interaction in the first-century.\(^4\) Like other issues addressed above,
this assessment is not necessarily inaccurate, but it cannot account for the dynamic
spectrum of meaning for the ancient RECIPROCITY schema and χάρις-language that
emerges at the interface of human interaction.\(^5\) As Barclay points out, “The common
representation of … do ut des … is right to recognize the reciprocity ethos of ancient
religious practice, but is wrong in putting one-sided stress on the human giver as the
initiator of the gift-cycle, and in suggesting a crude commercialism in the transaction.”\(^6\)
The question, as always, is how to interpret Paul’s χάρις-language without succumbing to
reductionism.

As illustrated in this chapter, the embodied hermeneutic used agrees with Barclay on
three key points: 1) the GIFT-GIVING schema is the best conceptual frame for Paul’s χάρις-
language; 2) Paul’s χάρις-language is not unique among his contemporaries, either Jew or
Gentile; and 3) neither SOLIDARITY nor EQUALITY are inherently opposed to RECIPROCITY.\(^7\)
Furthermore, both Barclay and Bonnie MacLachlan describe the ancient understanding of
χάρις and the RECIPROCITY schema in language analogous to ECS and complexity theory.
Bonnie MacLachlan describes χάρις as the psychological “disposition to react when
confronted with pleasure of a personal, social nature” in ways that created complex social
bonds. Since χάρις “designates the process and is applied both to the beautiful object that
arouses a response, and to the response itself,” it cannot be summarized as reciprocity.\(^8\)

Similarly, Barclay says:

The use of the language of debt indicates the common roots of the financial sphere
of loan-and-debt and the gift sphere of gift-and-return…. it was the proximity, yet
distinction, between these two transactional realms that was to become one of the

\(^4\) James R. Harrison, *Paul’s Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context*, WUNT 2/172 (Tübingen:
Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 85. Harrison also calls the magical papyri “a shadowy subculture,” but undermines his
argument by claiming that the magical papyri use χάρις as the central vox magica to secure χάριτες and

\(^5\) A survey of Polybius is sufficient to illustrate the point. e.g. *Hist.* 1.31.6, 1.43.3, 1.45.3, 2.22.5, 2.49.9,
2.61.7, 3.109.12, 5.77.3, 5.86.9, 5.86.11, 6.31.2, and 8.15.8.

\(^6\) Barclay *The Gift*, 28.


Press, 1993), 11.
problematics of the gift…. What distinguishes the sphere of gift is not that it is “unilateral,” but that it expresses a social bond, a mutual recognition of the value of the person. It is filled with sentiment because it invites a personal, enduring, and reciprocal relationship — an ethos very often signaled by the use of the term χάρις.\(^9\)

Therefore, this chapter describes Paul’s χάρις and δόξα-language as his prototypical Reception-Response expression that emerged from the new ontic potential for eternal physical life promised by the Christ-covenant and created complex social bonds based on the Christ-narrative. As in 4.2, a teleological, not mechanical, reciprocity frames Paul’s reception-response. The difference from Barclay, discussed in 11.2, is the emphasis that the existential category metamorphosis entailed in the Christ-narrative made Paul’s χάρις-language ontologically distinct from all other contemporary prayer language.\(^10\)

As an illustration, this brief comparison explains why Epictetus’ direct critique of reciprocity cannot be described as incidental to his main interest,\(^11\) and the direct critique of reciprocity cannot be described as the primary motivation for Paul’s use of χάρις-language. Both men used χάρις-language to extract practical theology (ethics) from an anthropological ontology. Like Paul, Epictetus used χάρις τῷ θεῷ as an example of standard dialogue and καὶ οὕτως ἂν ηὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἐφ’ οἷς δεῖ εὐχαριστεῖν to teach that God should be praised for whatever life situation occurs (Diss. 3.5.7–11). He personally thanked God for all things (χάριν σοι ἔχω πᾶσαν), and taught that the reasonable man is only concerned with what is under his control because the divine gift of reason is always available to determine correct action (Diss. 4.4.7–8). Therefore, Epictetus viewed χάρις as the only viable response to adversity because any other response (e.g. retaliation or revenge) is irrational, and therefore, ‘inhuman.’\(^12\) This view of χάρις would naturally conflict with a reciprocity system that became defined solely by the sphere of financial

---

9 Barclay *The Gift*, 27, 31. For the full discussion which covers a good many ancient sources, see 23–50.

10 Cf., Barclay, *The Gift*, 565, “Paul’s is one Jewish voice in a chorus of divergent opinions, distinctive in certain respects, but not qualitatively or quantitatively more distinct than the voices of other Jews.”

11 Contra Harrison, *Language of Grace*, 192. Contra Harrison, 2, Paul’s use of χάρις was not in stark contrast to the LXX use of ἔλεος as the central description of human and divine beneficence.

12 See Diss. 4.5, “If a quarrelsome person verbally abuses you, your response is πολλὴ χάρις because he has not struck you. If he has struck you, your response is πολλὴ χάρις because he has not wounded you. If he has wounded you, your response is πολλὴ χάρις because he has not killed you.” Even though Paul uses ἐφήνη, note the conceptual similarity in Rom 12:17-19: μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες· προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων· ἐν δυναμών τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖς ἐκδικήσεις, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὁργῇ, γέγραπται γάρ· Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις· Εγώ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος.
obligation because such a system extrapolates anthropological ontology from correct action.

The difference between Paul and Epictetus’ χάρις-language emerged from different anthropological prototypes based on different ontologies. Epictetus conceived the prototypical person in terms of a disembodied reason in which χάρις, even as a divine gift, can only address the existential human in situ. Paul’s prototypical human identity marker embodied ἐν Χριστῷ as the guarantor of eternal physical life posits a divine/human solidarity in which χάρις describes an alternative existence that is independent from sensorimotor perception, and yet can be perceived and manifested by sensorimotor action. Paul’s χάρις-language does not necessitate an intentional critique of the Graeco-Roman reciprocity system because his claim that death had been replaced by eternal life as the divine act of telic cosmic salvation would naturally conflict, at some point, with any Graeco-Roman reciprocity system, including Epictetus’ ontology of reason.

8.2) Scaled Solidarity in Paul’s Prayer-Greetings and Farewell-Blessings

This section examines three procedural markers to describe Paul’s understanding of the scaled solidarity inherent in the Christ-narrative and its teleological function within Christ-covenant participation: the roles assigned to Paul and his audiences via identity compression, the implied motion of the blessings, and the epistolary position of the blessings.

A) Role Compression and Scaled Solidarity

In the TRANSACTION frame, a divinely authorised agent brokers the transfer of assets to human recipients. For blessings, the organising frame can be more specifically described as GIFT-GIVING-BY-PROXY. Because gifts given in ab sentia function metonymically for the person who sent the gift, blessings are semantic representations of the relationship between the divine agent embodied by the broker and the recipient. In Paul’s prayer-

13 Though this phrase is from Rev 1:4, it follows the phrase χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη which is identified in this study as an early Christian ECIN.

14 The parallel with Barclay is his opinions “that there is something distinctive about the Torah’s legislation regarding care for the poor, yet this is best seen not as a rejection of ancient assumptions regarding gifts, but as a Jewish modulation of those assumptions, wholly dependent on the expectation of reciprocity — in a different form,” The Gift, 41; and that, as the theological basis for Paul’s mission, the “incongruous gift of Christ” bypasses and subverts pre-constituted systems of worth, both Jewish and Gentile, 6, 350, 452, 490, 531, 541. See section 11.2 for the similarities and differences between Barclay and this thesis concerning incongruity.

greetings, the phrase ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ achieves human scale by eliciting mental schemas associated with familial responsibility and official royal bequeathing. As the broker, Paul is assigned the singular role of a sibling carrying out his familial duty as a divinely commissioned royal emissary. The unique category of royal sibling signifies that Paul is the bearer of these powers and that distributing them is the nature of his commission and is inherent in his relationship with the audience. This role produces an intense scaled solidarity by compressing Cause-Effect and Purpose-Result into a singularity so that the blessing is a dynamic integrated action which emerges naturally at the interface of Paul’s interaction with his audience as one who is living in the emerging ontology of the Christ-covenant.

The royal sibling role also compresses Paul’s identity and the audiences’ identity which prohibits the passive reception of the blessing by assigning the audiences an inherent responsibility for volitional participation in the divine covenant. This means there was no difference, either in kind or degree, between Paul’s commissioning and the divine calling issued to his audiences. Just as Paul blesses them as a servant-apostle, they receive the blessing as those who have the same ontological status ἐν Χριστῷ which characterizes Paul’s apostleship. This does not deny or diminish any problems between Paul and his audiences, but maintains the awareness that Paul conceptualised his audiences and his relationship to them within the framework of ontological solidarity denoted by co-heirs ἐν Χριστῷ. This suggests that Paul had a high scale of expected that the prayer-greeting provided his audiences a sensorimotor experience of the Christ-covenant solidarity as an emerging ontological presence.

In the farewell-blessings, Paul’s role of royal sibling emissary obviously remains active. In each blessing, the abstract gifts εἰρήνη, χάρις, κοινωνία, and ἀγάπη are qualified by the personhood of Jesus, God, the Holy Spirit, and Paul. The emphasis is not on the gift as the telic benefit, but on the gift as a medium for global insight into the nature of the benefactor and the correlative solidarity. As with the prayer-greetings, the farewell-blessings

---

16 Per chapter six, any potential tension between the roles of sibling and royal emissary is mitigated by θεός πατρὸς and κύριος Ιησοῦ Χριστὸς occupying the same conceptual space as the singular source of the gift.

17 Note the reciprocity of Rom 1:12.

18 The hermeneutical impact of this assertion varies relative to ideas about the contentious setting of a particular letter. Although the parameters of this study prohibit a full investigation, this idea is repeatedly encountered in the following chapters.
empower the audiences for embodied covenant participation which prohibits passive reception as the telic purpose for the blessings.

B) Scaled Solidarity in the Implied Motion of Gift-Giving

The lack of a lexicalised verb in the prayer-greetings and the farewell-blessings can obscure the intent of the benedictions to empower and encourage proactive covenant participation. However, the previous chapter showed that verbal modality was not determinative for the emotive scale of Paul’s prayers. This section illustrates why the absence of a lexicalised verb is negligible since there are sufficient lexical procedural markers for inferring the intended motion. In fact, for these blessings, the lack of a lexicalised verb intensifies Paul’s scale of semantic optativity regarding the sensorimotor experience of the Christ-covenant solidarity.

(i) Prayer-Greetings as Access Paths

In the prayer-greetings, the pronoun ὑμῖν and the ἀπό phrase are access paths with a linear trajectory that makes the Christ-covenant solidarity immediately accessible in the blessings because they function as instantiations of that solidarity. The emergence of the phrase χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη as a function of the complexity necessary for Christianity to survive as an independent religious adaptive system was discussed in chapter four. The issue here is that conventional questions concerning the ἀπό phrase unnecessarily detract from its function as an explicit, though optional, access path.

Except for First Thessalonians, the prayer-greeting in the undisputed letters contains the phrase ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Thess 1:1 reads τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη). Typically, the need to explain 1 Thess as an outlier arises from the view that the ἀπό phrase is an expansion of an original χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη blessing. Murphy-O’Connor says Paul used the addition because he felt the need to give the audience “a specifically Christian dimension.” Murphy-O’Connor, Paul the Letter Writer, 54.

Philip Tite says the expansion is responsible for the blessing’s divine source and authority “under which both sender and recipients are subordinate,” and its omission is due to the description of the Thessalonian ἐκκλησία.

19 Murphy-O’Connor, Paul the Letter Writer, 54.
20 Tite, “How to Begin,” 74.
As discussed earlier, the mechanistic character of Murphy-O’Connor’s suggestion is not helpful. Tite’s analysis is much closer to an embodied hermeneutic, especially his description of the function of the ἀπό phrase. Yet, his rationale for the lack of the ἀπό phrase in 1 Thess needs to be qualified so that it is not considered an omission, nor categorized as an expansion in the other letters. René Doursat and Jean Petitot argue that spatial prepositions allow for metonymic inferences which create image transformations.\(^{21}\) This means that the ἐν phrase in the 1 Thess greeting is semantically equivalent to the ἀπό phrase in the others. The difference was, most likely, generated by the order of the greeting.

However, there are two noteworthy considerations. First, the prayer-greeting in Second Thessalonians is the same as First Thessalonians, and the ἀπό phrase, which is unquestionably accepted, follows χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Wanamaker makes a good argument against authorship as a sufficient explanation.\(^{22}\) Second, Codex Sinaiticus shows the ἀπό phrase following χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη in 1 Thess, even though Codex Vaticanus has the shorter reading which receives the \{A\} level of certainty by Metzger.\(^{23}\) Because the principles of emergent optativity are transferrable to emergent solidarity in divine agency compression, it is the omission of ἡμῶν in I Thess that would be significant, if indeed there were any real cognitive dissonance.\(^{24}\)

The primary reason that the omission of the ἀπό phrase in 1 Thess attracts the reader’s attention is the comparative study of Pauline texts based on a functionalist concept of language. The distribution of meaning and inferential processing allows the specifically Christian semantic of the prayer-greeting to emerge without the ἀπό phrase. Assuming the shorter reading is original to 1 Thess, and that it is Paul’s first letter, the subsequent change is best understood as the ontogenetic tendency towards linguistic synchronicity.


\(^{23}\) Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 561. The Sinaiticus reading is significant because the codex may represent the earliest copy of the NT. Despite unanswered problems of date and provenance for both codices, the shorter reading of Vaticanus cannot be considered de facto evidence that the ἀπό phrase was not original to 1 Thess. For an interesting description of both texts see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 7–8, 42–48.

\(^{24}\) It is not significant, but quite interesting that ἡμῶν is accepted in 2 Thess with a \{C\} rating. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 567.
within similar contexts. The ἀπό phrase should not be categorized as an expansion of the χάρις-blessing because the change also involved the order of the prayer-greeting. As Paul continued to write letters, his phrasing naturally, and probably unintentionally, congealed to reduce cognitive processing effort. Undoubtedly, both the ἀπό phrase and the order of the prayer-greeting in the other letters made communication with the audience more efficient due to the lack of a lexicalised verb. However, the extra effort required in 1 Thess is negligible, and would not be an issue in isolation.

(ii) Farewell-blessings as Advent Paths

In the farewell-blessings, μετά functions as an Advent Path that compresses the intermediate actions necessary for the attributes χάρις, εἰρήνη, κοινωνία, and ἀγάπη to represent the state of being conferred upon the recipients when Paul issues the blessing. The consistency and variation of these blends makes seeing a list profitable:

| Rom 15:33 | Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀμήν. |
| Rom 16:20b | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν. |
| 1 Cor 16:23 | ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν. |
| 1 Cor 16:24 | ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. |
| 2 Cor 13:13 | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη του θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. |
| Gal 6:18 | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί• ἀμήν. |
| Phil 4:23 | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. |
| 1 Thess 5:28 | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν. |
| Phlm 25 | Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. |

Except for Rom 15:33, the blessings evidence explicit lexical dependence on the Christ-narrative. Yet, the context of Rom 15:30 means that Ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης in 15:33 is neither a generic blessing, nor a rote transposition of Judaic tradition. Instead, it emerges from a teleological order of growth governed by a specific divine agent of εἰρήνη within the Christ-covenant.

Seven of the eight remaining farewell-blessings feature χάρις as the gift mediated by the divine agent τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Five include the modifier Χριστοῦ, and three include ἡμῶν. Although this means ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν was a prototypical blessing construct for Paul, it does not identify the construct as an original prayer which was
contextually expanded. Rather, any modifiers are procedural markers for Paul’s scale of semantic optativity that the audience will understand his message. Thus, εἰρήνη, κοινωνία, and ἀγάπη are semantically equivalent to χάρις because they signify the state of the relationship between Paul and his audience via the Christ-narrative.

In each farewell-blessing, the gift, be it the grace of the Lord Jesus, the peace and love of God, the communion of the Spirit, or even the love of Paul, maps the divine action embodied in the resurrection of Christ and, correlatively, the promise of the bodily resurrection of believers. The discussion in 8.5 explains why this idea is not jeopardized by the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμῶν. Such dualistic phrasing may, in fact, be necessitated by a high emotive scale and reflect the limitations of embodied cognition.

8.3) The Emergence of Solidarity in Paul’s Conditional Blessings

This section shows that the limits of embodied cognition and the dissonances inherent in Paul’s claims are significant to the interpretation of 2 Cor 13:11, Phil 4:7, Phil 4:9, and Gal 6:16. Except in Galatians, conditionality in these blessings is typically rejected even though each appear to assume that participation in the Christ-covenant was in some measure dependent upon the volition of the audience. The following analysis shows that each blessing conceptualizes the coexistence of ontological solidarity and ontic conditionality because of the emergent motion of the Christ-covenant. Prior to making the argument, it is helpful to review some representative concerns over contingent readings.

A) The Conventional Concern Over Conditionality in Paul’s Blessings

Although Murray Harris reads 2 Cor 13:11 as a prayer, he references Héring and Depasse-Livet’s opinion that 13:11b is “a benediction in the form of a promise,” and quotes O’Brien’s DPL article that a benediction simultaneously refers to “the grace and peace of God in which [Paul’s readers] already participate and (wish-) prayers that they may appreciate and experience these blessings more fully.” Harris’ concern seems to be that a conditional reading implies an interruption in the Corinthians’ experience of God’s grace and peace because he identifies only two options for relating καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ’ ύμων in 2 Cor 13:11 to what precedes.

If καὶ is given the sense “and then”, its clause will state the result of seeking to follow the five preceding injunctions…. In 13:11 Paul would be suggesting, not

that the divine presence was conditional upon or a reward for obeying his admonitions, but that God’s presence was a natural consequence of obedience. Alternatively, v. 11b may specify the divine resources of love and peace that will enable the Corinthians to follow Paul’s injunctions given in v. 11a. This view, which is to be preferred, has the advantage of relating the two descriptive genitives (τῆς ἀγάπης and τῆς εἰρήνης) directly to v. 11a. God is not only characterized by love and peace; he also actually imparts these virtues to empower believers to fulfill what is required of them (v. 11a). Since the verb in v. 11b is an indicative (ἔσται), not an optative (εἴη), the statement Paul makes is in effect a promise.26

The first option does not appear to make a clear distinction between a reward for obedience and a logical consequence of obedience. Both are contingent upon obedience. The second option does not explicitly state how καί is to be understood, but seems to suggest a preference for a sense of purpose rather than the resultative ‘and then.’ Regardless, it is not clear how this option relates the genitives more directly to 11a than the first. Emphasizing divine agency does not resolve the question of contingency, and the status of the statement as a promise cannot be established solely upon the verbal mood. Paul’s prayer language examined thus far suggests that, if the sentence had come to a full stop after εἰρηνεύετε, the blessing could easily have read ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης εἴη μεθ’ ὑμῶν, or ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μεθ’ ὑμῶν.

Victor Furnish, without any exegetical reasoning, simply states, “The point is not that God’s presence will come as a reward for obedience, but that God’s presence will (a “logical” future) enable the Corinthians to be restored.”27 In this construal, understanding ἔσται as a logical future does not resolve the issue of conditionality, and reading καταρτίζεσθε and παρακαλεῖσθε as passives do not resolve the issue of agency.28 The imperative mood suggests the necessary immediate cooperation of the audience in the action, and there is no alternative agent presented.29

26 Harris, Second Corinthians, 935.


28 See Furnish, II Corinthians, 581–582 for why he reads the verbs as passives.

29 Some of Furnish’s other exegetical efforts seem to be aimed at establishing God as the active agent. He postulates that Paul adapted his normal peace blessing by replacing the “usual connective” δέ with καί which “ties the promise more effectively to the preceding admonitions,” citing Phil 4:9b as further evidence. He reads ἐγέρσης as an expansion of Paul’s usual reference to ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, thereby emphasizing that God’s love is “the most pertinent to and therefore most supportive of the preceding admonitions.” II Corinthians, 586.
Ralph Martin recognizes that the future indicative connotes conditionality, but, like Harris, is concerned that conditionality implies “more a wish than a declaration.” Even so, he remarks that ἔσται μεθ’ ὑμῶν “invites us to examine the basis for the promise of 13:11b.” The question then becomes, is it possible to examine 2 Cor 13:11 without reading conditionality?

In Phil 4:7, John Lange and Philip Schaff raise concerns about the translation of φρουρήσει with the present subjunctive custodiat in the Vulgate: “φρουρήσει signifies to guard, while the tense marks the continuance of this protection; it is a promise, assurance, not a wish (Vulg., custodiat, et al).” However, as evidenced by the jussive subjunctive, the Latin present subjunctive can indicate conditionality and a speaker’s attitude of certainty. In this case, further evidence that modality cannot be the single determining interpretive factor is that while the active imperative χαίρετε is represented by the active imperative gaude (4:4), the negative injunction μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε is represented by the subjunctive Nihil solliciti sitis (4:6). Furthermore, both the aorist passive imperative γνωσθήτω (4:5) and the present passive imperative γνωρίζεσθω (4:6) are represented by the respective present active subjunctives nota sit and innotescant.

Marcello De Martino shows that Latin grammatical rules are not sufficient to accommodate these modal variances because ancient Latin grammarians struggled with translating Greek verbs due to differences in modality. He cites Priscianus (6th c. AD) as one example: “Greeks also have a number of imperative forms in the preterit tense, which we are totally unable to have in active diathesis or in neutral verbs, whereas, in passive diathesis and in all verbs having the participles of the preterit tense, we can have preterit imperatives by periphrastic construction.” Thus, it is possible that all the modal variance


31 Martin, 2 Corinthians, 501. Paul Barnett seems to take a mediating position, “The assurance … is cognate with each of the five preceding admonitions … The God who is love and peace will bestow these blessings on the Corinthians as they heed the apostle’s injunctions. God imparts his unique qualities to his children as they actively do his will,” The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 617.


listed above were influenced by morphological availability. At any rate, this is another illustration that the idea of unaffected meaning is errant.

O’Brien critiques those, specifically Harder, who read φρουρήσει conditionally of arriving “at this decision on formal or stylistic grounds without giving sufficient weight to the sentence within its immediate context.” At least towards Harder, this charge has three weaknesses. First, the technical linguistic term for Harder’s classification is pragmatic, not formal or stylistic. Second, based on investigating the subjunctive, optative, and future indicative modalities in the LXX, and the use of the future indicative for prayers in the magical papyri, Harder concluded that there was significant overlap modal function. Third, he appears to have wrestled with the modal implications of φρουρήσει and the positivism which he detected in Paul’s use of the blessing: “Diese indikativische Form in Gebeten kann ihren Grund in der unbedingten Erhörungsgewißheit haben, also in einem psychologischen Phänomen.” Instead, O’Brien argues that φρουρήσει is not conditional because:

καί is consecutive, introducing the result of what precedes: as a consequence of the Philippians letting their requests be made known to God with thanksgiving, his peace will guard them. V. 7… is a specific and certain promise about God’s peace that is attached to the encouraging admonition of v. 6. Most significantly, this promise about God’s peace guarding the Philippians is given irrespective of whether their concrete requests (αἰτήματα) are granted or not…. God’s peace will be powerfully at work in their lives as a result (καί) of their pouring out their hearts in petition with thanksgiving, not because they have made requests that are perfectly in line with the will of God.

Though O’Brien correctly highlights the significance of the blessing as it relates to any anticipated answers to prayer, one must question how the specificity and certainty of the blessing in relation to 4:6 preclude it from being conditional if καί introduces result. The unavoidable conditionality connoted by φρουρήσει is the guarantee of God’s protection if the conditions are met. The question addressed in the next section is whether the opposite condition is necessarily implied— that God will not protect those who do not fulfill the conditions.


37 Harder, Gebet, 25, n. 1. This seems contrary to his opinion that Gebetsaporie was the central problem for first-century people. Wiles uses the same quote from Harder to defend classifying Phil 4:7 as a wish-prayer.

38 O’Brien, Philippians, 495–496.

39 Phil 4:7 is the apodosis to Phil 4:6 listed in chapter ten.
B) Solidarity and Conditionality as Coordinate Functions of Complex Adaptivity

The concerns of these representative commentators can be summarized under two headings: 1) The relationship between conditionality and certainty; 2) The role of human agency in the economy of God’s action. The first concern is resolved by understanding the non-sequitur “denying the antecedent,” which is asserting that a conditional statement necessitates a parallel counterfactual scenario. Any statement constituted by “If X Then Y” naturally elicits the counterfactual scenario “If Not X Then Not Y.” However, just because the counterfactual scenario is a natural result of the basic operation of human cognition does not mean it is a logical necessity. It is only evidence of the basic cognitive ability for imaginative counterfactual integration.40

When the characteristics of the cause are unduly deduced from those of the effect, Fauconnier and Turner call it Cause-Effect Isomorphism. They use the example that while a balloon burst is an abrupt and disruptive effect, the cause is a steady, potentially gentle, stream of air. Isomorphism is assuming, upon seeing the balloon burst, that the cause must be equally as sudden and dramatic.41 In Paul’s conditional blessings, Effect-Cause Isomorphism occurs when the characteristics of the effect are unduly deduced from those of the cause.

The problem is that conditional constructs are often built on the language-experience paradox. The conditional construct “Do this, and this will happen” compresses time and space to create a causal link which may only be legitimate in the blend. For example, the parental instruction, “Clean your room and you will get ice cream,” is a cause-effect blend. If the child complies, the actual cause is still the purchase and delivery of the reward by the parent. The advantage for the parent and child to live in the blend is to reinforce the reality that actions, including inaction, shape the environment in which we live. However, such conditional blends are exemplary, not predictive.42

Similarly, the conditions of Paul’s blessings are idealised generalisations which create the impression of direct and comprehensive access to the blessing by compressing a diverse

40 It is also imperative to remember that this basic ability is necessary for anything approaching creative or innovative thinking.


42 A more serious example is the construct in Gen 3:3, which, for some, is a theological blend in which all causes of human deaths are compressed into a singularity. There are any number of examples for which a direct application of this blend to a specific situation is disastrous.
range of actions and attitudes into a single protasis. Commands such as rejoice, be restored, be at peace, do not be anxious, and do whatever you have seen me do, have open ended inputs which are also blended spaces that are dependent on individual idiosyncratic blending to create the immediate individual experience.\(^{43}\) This makes it difficult, at best, to infer how a particular apodosis is affected by an unfulfilled protasis. When exegetes try to discern details such as debating if εἰρήνη refers to the inward peace of the soul, the blend is disrupted and forced to elicit a meaning which may be beyond its scope.\(^ {44}\)

The second concern is resolved by not confusing the ontological level of the Christ-covenant with the ontic level of human experience. The missional function of Paul’s conditional blessings, even Gal 6:16, was to give his audiences direct and comprehensive access to the immediate actualisation of the life-structured Christ-covenant ontology. Yet, the intensity of Paul’s paraenesis reflects his acute awareness of that the death-structured ontology presents significant ontic danger, even as it stands defeated. Therefore, an unfulfilled protasis would limit access to the emerging life-structured ontology within the specific conditions of a particular blended apodosis. However, this point is not open to the criticism that all of Paul’s blended apodoses are mapped with the scene of the Parousia and resurrection of believers, so that any unfulfilled protasis incurs some level of teleological, thus salvific, risk. Such a criticism conflates blessings with curses, and, paraphrasing Wright, amounts to substituting ethical categories for eschatological ones.\(^ {45}\)

Instead, conceptual blending precludes the counterfactual implication that non-compliance with the Paul’s conditional prayers necessarily removes his audiences from God’s protection.

8.4) Paul’s Doxologies and the Emergence of the Life-Structured Ontology

Ostmeyer writes, “Segnen und Verherrlichen sind für Paulus Möglichkeiten der wechselseitigen Kommunikation mit Gott, vermittelt durch Christus…. Wird δοξάζω mit seinem ganzen Bedeutungsspektrum als ein Gebetsterminus aufgefasst, folgt daraus, dass für Paulus das gesamte Leben des Christen Gebet ist.”\(^ {46}\) Therefore, this section examines

\(^{43}\) For the argument that the corporate and individual aspects of communication are partially independent of one another, see Delia Belleri, “Meta-representation in utterance comprehension: The case of semantically incomplete expressions,” JPragmat 57 (2013): 158–169.

\(^{44}\) See discussion in O’Brien, Philippians, 512.

\(^{45}\) Wright, P&FG, 2:1413.

\(^{46}\) Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 77–79.
Paul’s use of χάρις τῷ θεῷ and εὐλογητός / δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας as parallel emergent functions of the epistemic availability of the Christ-covenant. Like the opening and closing prayers, these doxologies can be neglected because they give the impression of customary habit due to their respective affinity with Graeco-Roman and 2T Jewish prayers, and, at times, they seem to appear suddenly, giving the impression of emotional interjection. As a counter measure, the first sub-section considers the potential that the particle δέ functioned as a procedural marker that the Christ-covenant was a replacement ontology. The second sub-section discusses Paul’s doxologies as functions of time, space, and embodiment.

A) The Particle δέ as a Procedural Marker of a Replacement Ontology

Many of Paul’s χάρις doxologies contain the postpositive particle δέ (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ). This section proposes that, in most cases, the adversative force of δέ is a strong procedural marker for Paul’s audiences to understand that, despite the immediate contrary sensorimotor data, the Christ-covenant restructured the ontology of the human existential condition, and that ontic participation in this new ontology is immediately accessible. A significant emotive scalar marker for this argument is the collocation ‘sin-and-death’ which compresses Cause-Effect into a single construct which can then be destroyed by the singular physical resurrection of Jesus. The relatively easier places to make this argument are Rom 6:17–18, Rom 7:25, and 1 Cor 15:56–57.

In Rom 6:17–18 is a contrast between two cognitive blends. In one, DEATH is the prototypical ontological master of an ontic structure in which sin which inevitably leads to the ontic experience of death as the natural function of human behaviour. In the other, LIFE is the prototypical ontological master of an ontic structure in which volitional human righteousness inevitably preserves the ontic experience of life. The ontic potential for human choice between the ‘two ways’ is not new, but inherited from Christianity’s Jewish parentage. The new level of complexity is the claim that the ontological structure which prohibits death as an ontic human experience is currently emerging. Therefore, the new ontic potential of choosing between the ‘two ways’ has been restructured from access paths which lead to one or the other, to advent paths which emerge as one or the other. The adversative force of δέ emphasises this change in potential ontic participation from a certain future to a certain present.
Thus, Romans 7:7–25 is not “The Problem of Indwelling Sin.”47 The problem is the cognitive and perceptive dissonance between the idea that the new ontological structure of life created by the Christ-covenant is immediately available to embodied persons despite the remaining ontic structure of sin and death. The adversative force of δὲ is that the physical resurrection of Jesus is singularly sufficient embodied evidence of the new ontological structure despite infinite ontic examples to the contrary. Just as above, faith has been restructured from believing in a certain future to believing in a certain present. The problem is that there is no adequate linguistic temporal representation.

Fortunately, 1 Cor 15:57 is far more dependent upon cognitive blending that is directly based on embodied cognition. The previous verse is a blend that describes the ontological structure of sin and death by mapping a poisonous sting onto sin to create a direct embodied link to death. Then, the concept of justice is mapped onto the law to create a logical organising frame for the blend in which death is not accidental or avoidable, but the natural law of the ontological structure. Thus, the emphatic adversative force of δὲ is obviously linked to the physical resurrection of Jesus in 15:57 through the divine agency identity compression τῷ διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ νῖκος διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Even though sensorimotor categories are just as obvious in 2 Cor 2:14, in this case, embodied cognition seems to create more difficulty than relief. The key issue is the translation θριαμβεύω, for which BDAG offers six options, and Harris remarks that “No fewer than ten different senses have been proposed.”48 If θριαμβεύοντι refers to the image of a Roman victory procession, are believers analogous to the victorious soldiers led by their victorious general or are they analogous to the captured enemies led in shame towards execution or slavery? The syntax θριαμβεύω plus a direct object could give the sense of God gaining victory over the believers which would give weight to the latter. Calvin rejected the image of disgraced captives because of the dissonance between that image and the immediate sense of Paul’s utterance. He opted for the image of victorious soldiers, and translated θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς as “who causes us to triumph.”49

---

47 The label in the UBS
48 Harris, Second Corinthians, 244.
49 John Calvin and John Pringle, Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, vol. 2 (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010), 157–158.
Rory Egan has made the case that neither of these interpretations is suitable.\(^50\) He traces the history of interpretation for 2 Cor 2:14 to argue that \(\text{θριαμβεύω}\) was not always associated with a victory procession.\(^51\) Egan’s claim is that the Greek cultural connotation of \(\text{θριαμβεύω}\) as ‘display, divulge, make manifest, etc.,’ became overshadowed by the Roman idea of victory procession due to the translation of \(\text{triumphare}\) with \(\text{θριαμβεύω}\). His proposes recovering the Greek concept could render the translation: “But thanks be to God who is always making us known in Christ and revealing through us the odour of his knowledge in every place.”\(^52\)

This interpretation of \(\text{θριαμβεύω}\) not only renders a clearer sentence, it provides a conceptual link to 2:13, which has also been the subject of considerable debate.\(^53\) Embodied cognition suggests that Paul’s failure to find Titus after extensive searching triggered the doxology, again, as an affirmation that the ontological structure of the Christ-covenant was determinative regardless of sensorimotor data. This understanding is strengthened because the coordinate verb \(\text{φανερόω}\) emphasizes the visual sensory experience.

The next question would be, what triggered the use of the olfactory sense? Here the proposal is the influence of the conceptualisation of prayers as incense.\(^54\) Note how Rev 5:8 and 8:4 identify the prayers of the saints as incense that raises up to God. In 5:8, the prayers precipitate the new song of praise, and in 8:4 the prayers fuel the judgment of God upon the earth. Paul expressed the same synergism in 2 Cor 2:15–16: \(\text{ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, οἷς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν.}\)

Therefore, it seems reasonable to read 2:14 as a parallelism where \(\text{τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ}\) has a conceptual focus and \(\text{τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι’ ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ}\) has a sensory focus. It also seems reasonable that it was


\(^51\) Egan also rejects the idea of a Dionysiac procession metaphor. Egan, “Lexical Evidence,” 42.

\(^52\) Egan, “Lexical Evidence,” 50.


\(^54\) See discussion on prayer and remembrance in chapter six.
the act of prayer itself that triggered Paul’s use of the olfactory metaphor. The conclusion is that the blessing is a blend which represents Paul’s covenant participation as contextualised by 2:13, but can neither be satisfactorily characterized as a spontaneous outburst or a sudden leap in Paul’s thought.

Instead, the adversative force of δέ carries the same image of τὸ νῖκος διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as in 1 Cor 15:57. Only in this case, the victory is more vividly illustrated by Paul’s use of the sensory perceptions of sight and smell, and his personal application of the principle to an actual life situation. Though it is not necessary that Paul was explicitly aware of every implication of his blessing, and it is true that the utterance is a bit surprising for the reader, it is necessary to understand the doxology as an intentional expression of Paul’s faith that the resurrection of Jesus must determine how one assigns meaning to the events and objects encountered at the interface of one’s environment. This latter claim is the basis for interpreting the adversative force of δέ in 2 Cor 8:16 as presenting Titus as a representative identity for the Corinthian community rather than a satisfactory representative for Paul. The rationale is that doxology follows Paul’s description of the generosity he desires from the Corinthians. It seems better to understand the prayer as, “But thanks be to God who put this very type of compassion in the heart of Titus towards you.” Then, the ὅτι clause is epexegetical: “Although he welcomed the request to come to you, the eagerness with which he did so was his own genuine expression.” Though αὐθαίρετος is mostly associated with the concept of a free will choice, it may also suggest that Titus used his personal finances in his ministry to the Corinthians. Here, the adversativity of δέ evokes a counterfactual scenario with a corrective sense, such as, “Just think where you would be if God had not placed this level of compassion for you in Titus’ heart.” The emotive force is Paul’s genuine thanks to God that the resurrection of Christ makes the ontic participation in the covenant so readily accessible.

55 It is interesting to note that the reference to ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτήν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ in Philippians 4:18 is followed closely by the prayer in 4:20 (possibly 4:19).

56 Contra Harris and Barrett.

57 A major interpretive problem is identifying the referent for τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The NIV, ESV, CJB, NRSV, NET, MSG construe it as Paul’s effort to legitimise Titus as his representative, so that the referent is the same care which Paul had toward the Corinthians. Cf. Harris, Second Corinthians, 598, “the presence of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (“for you,” “for your welfare”) after τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδὴν shows that αὐτὴν must refer to the “same” zeal as Paul himself has for the Corinthians.”
The particle does not appear in 2 Cor 9:15 because the χάρις doxology is an affirmation of the immediate context in which the divine gift conceptualises the shift from a human ontology structures by sin and death to an ontology structured by everlasting life. For Paul, this shift included an intensification of the traditional Jewish connection between holiness and almsgiving. Therefore, not only is generosity the prototypical organising frame for this blend, Paul presents it as the prototypical organising frame for interpersonal behaviour for ontic participation in the emerging Christ-covenant ontology.

B) Victory in Jesus: Time, Space, and Embodiment in Paul’s Doxologies

This section examines how εὐλογητός / δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν functioned as an advent path that compressed the historic messianic narrative into the person of Jesus.\(^5\)\(^8\) Regardless of text critical issues, the prime example is Rom 16:25–27:\(^5\)\(^9\)

\[25 \text{Tῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ύμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνιος αἰωνίως σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ, ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὦ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.}\]

Were it not for the claim that the historical narrative of Jesus was the cosmic Heilsgeschichte which embodied the eternal wisdom of God, Paul’s use of this doxology would not have exceeded the limits of tolerable variation within 2T Judaism. For example, the concept Rom 1:16–25 that giving praise to God was obligatory based on his inherent right to judge the world role as creator. Similarly, Rom 9:5 fits the pattern of praising God following a summary recounting of divine action. The blessings in Rom 11:36 and 16:27 were possibly prompted by the uniqueness of θεός created in the previous blends Ω βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ and μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ respectively. Rom 11:36 affirms God’s eternal qualification to show mercy and sustain his covenants independent from human belief or behavior. Finally, it is likely that the inherited Jewish “God as Father” image contributed to his use of the prayer blessing in Gal 1:5 and Phil 4:20.\(^6\)\(^0\)

---

\(^{58}\) This analytic distinction between the χάρις doxologies and the εὐλογητός / δόξα doxologies is only meant to illustrate the integrative function of Paul’s doxologies and should not be understood as either typological or topological. A direct connection between δόξα and χάρις is not unknown in the LXX—ἔστιν αἰσχύνη ἐπάγουσα ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἔστιν αἰσχύνη δόξα καὶ χάρις (Pr 20:11a and Sir 4:21).

\(^{59}\) See Gamble, Textual History.

\(^{60}\) See discussion on Jewish tradition of “God as Father” image in chapter ten.
Although the intense emotion of this discernibly Jewish doxology makes the interpretation of a spontaneous and uncontrolled outburst of piety attractive, Paul’s consistent unique identification of θεός as the praiseworthy agent of the specifically Christological Heilsgeschichte makes it better to understand his doxologies as emergent properties of the respective discourses. The significance of one’s perspective is illustrated by the way many English versions translate 2 Cor 11:31 by bracketing ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας with parentheses or dashes. Although it does have the merit of highlighting the intense emotion that is involved, this type of rendition obscures the cognitive significance that the blessing affirms the eternal status of θεός as the Father of the Lord Jesus.61 Rather than an interjection or reflexive religious transliteration, the blessing compresses the veracity of the Christ-narrative and the veracity of Paul’s testimony, concerning his myriad of trials, his daring escape, and his humility before God and people.62 The preference here is to separate the divine collocation as in the 1984 Lutherbibel Standardausgabe, “Gott, der Vater des HERRN Jesus, der gelobt sei in Ewigkeit, weiß, daß ich nicht lüge,” and the La Sainte Bible (NVSR), “Dieu, qui est le Père du Seigneur Jésus, et qui est béni éternellement, sait que je ne mens pas!...”63 However, this issue may be intractable to translation due to the underdetermination of language and the fact that, unless it manifests, the emergence of a life-structured ontology remains beyond human conception.64

Therefore, Paul’s use of the εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας doxology must be understood as a non-linear, non-algorithmic, yet non-random compression of time which presents the present, past, and future as emergent descriptions of the teleological motion of the Christ-covenant. This

61 e.g. NRSV, NRSVA, YLT, KNOX, OJB, and CJB. The more common method of setting the phrase off with commas has the same, though less dramatic, effect. The ERV inverts the verse, rendering, “God knows that I am not lying. He is the God and Father of the Lord Jesus, and he is to be praised forever.” Similar approaches are taken in the NCV, NIRV, and WE.

62 See the discussion of 2 Cor 11:31 as an oath in chapter nine.

63 Yet, the addition of the ellipsis in the latter still intimates an interjection.

64 A similar issue is the debate whether Paul directly refers to Jesus as θεός in Rom 9:5. For an overview of the debate see George Carraway, Christ Is God Over All: Romans 9:5 in the context of Romans 9-11, LNTS 49 (London: T&T Clark, 2013), 1–21. CBT helps by showing that Paul’s prayer language consistently evidences divine identity compressions that create two coordinate, yet dissonant, cognitive spaces. One equates Χριστός with θεός and the other maintains Χριστός and θεός as separate unique identities. The fluidity of conceptual blending allows Rom 9:5 to contain a unique θεός who should be eternally praised for the physical reign of Χριστός θεός over everything. The phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα could not only maintain independent unique identities for Χριστός and θεός, but simultaneously affirm the physical reign of Χριστός θεός. Regardless, the divinity of Jesus in Rom 9:5 is not dependent upon punctuation, potential textual emendation, Paul’s Christology vis-à-vis Jewish monotheism, or any progression involved in the worship of Jesus as God. It is, in some way, dependent upon the power of conceptual blending to achieve human scale for the necessary complexity required by the claim that Jesus was the Christological teleology of the will of God.
blend compresses time by scaling up rather than down. The phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας entails any potential, or even imaginable, human context. It compresses the entirety of the human experience into one state or event. The phrase τῶν αἰώνων (Gal 1:5, Phil 4:20) further intensifies the compression by nesting εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in a larger blend so that the state or event becomes unchangeable.

The inclusion of ἀμήν gives the blend an indisputable veracity and invites the audience to live in the blend by giving their assent.65 The best example of this space compression is 2 Cor 1:18–22, which creates a conceptual blend in which the person Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is a metonym the speech acts of worship. Paul creates this blend by compressing the entirety of his preaching into the single concept ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. By including ὥσαι ἐπαγγελίαι θεοῦ, he compresses the Hebrew Scriptures into the same space. In the blend, Jesus is the embodiment of the divine narrative which is determinative for Paul’s definition and understanding of truth. Once the narrative of the scripture and Paul’s narrative about Christ are made to be Christ in the blend, then the person of Jesus functions as both Paul’s response to the Corinthians and his response to God.

Read this way, this text supports Ostmeyer because it reveals that a fundamental aspect of Paul’s narrative theologising was to conceptualise his mission as the embodiment of the Christ-covenant so that his every word and action gave his audience direct access and global insight into the active and dynamic Kommunikationssphäre der Gottes und Christus. In this passage, Paul deftly reorients the audience away from any controversy over what he said to the implications of what he perceived in the resurrected Jesus: the absolute solidarity among Christ-covenant participants. The eternal Ναί meant the Corinthians could measure the integrity of all his thoughts and desires, including his desire to visit them, by the content and character of his preaching, because his preaching was nothing more, nor less, than a manifestation of the Christ-covenant solidarity.

However, this covenant solidarity was not an end unto itself, but a partial manifestation of the emerging life-structured ontology. As discussed in the prayer reports, partial mapping allows the entirety of human history to be viewed and evaluated in the locative ἐν αὐτῷ as an ontological designation for Jesus as the incarnation of the divine narrative without declaring that preaching the message constitutes the actual physical presence of Jesus.

Instead, preaching the message creates the same partial presence discussed earlier which heightens the anticipation of the eventual physical presence. Hence, the powerful image constructed in verse 22 is predicated upon the claim that the Οὔ-excluding ontology is emerging into the ontic realm of sensorimotor experience. The concept that the resurrection of Jesus guaranteed the emergence of just such an eternal life-structured existence gave rise to the God-glorifying ἀμὴν that was a specifically ‘Christian’ prayer. The point is that Paul’s use of the εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας doxology is further evidence that his preaching, teaching, and prayer are nearly indistinguishable because they are all functions of the complexity that defined the possibilities and potentials of emergent Christianity as an independent complex adaptive religious system.

Yet, with the caveat that the inherent human capacity for pattern finding has misled more than one exegete, it may be that embodied cognition influenced the development of a pattern in Paul’s use of εὐλογητός and δόξα. It appears that εὐλογητός tends to occur when the context emphasizes human speech, and δόξα tends to occur when the emphasis is on divine action. For example, εὐλογητός is presented as the corrective of Rom 1:25 which focuses on those who did not acknowledge God properly. In Rom 9:5, εὐλογητός κτλ. follows a summary of the history of Israel, and has the context of speaking and power of the “word of God,” exemplified by how the Scriptures are employed. εὐλογητός in 2 Cor 11:31 is contextualized by Paul’s defence of the truthfulness of his testimony. The unfolding of divine action διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as it related to the salvation of the Gentiles in Rom16:25–27 culminates with δόξα. The context of δόξα κτλ. in Rom 11:36 is the cosmic and infinite power of God’s mercy where the emphasis is on divine action as an extension of divine nature. In Gal 1:5, the context is the salvific action of God for Paul and his audience. In Phil 4:20, the emphasis is on God’s perpetual sustenance for Paul’s audience, and may also have been encouraged by the previous phrase κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ ἐν δόξῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Since meaning emerges form a wide distribution of potential actions, if this pattern is viable, it was subconscious and not prescriptive. Nevertheless, it illustrates the potential effect of embodiment upon speech. When Paul focused on something observable, or something that could be conceived as observable, his tendency was to use δόξα. If the focus was on the content of the speech, his tendency was to use εὐλογητός.
8.5) Conclusion

Even though Paul’s blessings and doxologies share linguistic and conceptual affinities with both Graeco-Roman and 2T Jewish prayer, the time and space compressions required by the Christ-narrative force Paul’s language to press the limits of human imagination with a complex teleological logic that Christ-covenant participation entailed a categorical metamorphosis of the human person which manifested as a categorical metamorphosis in human cognition, language, and behaviour.

Paul’s prayer-greetings and farewell-blessings declared that there was no difference, in kind or degree, between his apostolic commissioning and the divine calling issued to every covenant participant. The fact that the blessings ignore any problems addressed in the ‘body’ of the letters reflects Paul’s conceptualization of the ontological insoluble solidarity of the Christ-covenant. It can neither be dissolved nor qualified (i.e. solved) by ontic disunity. The dominance of χάρις in the opening and closing blessings frames Paul’s letters as metonymical representations of the physical presence of Jesus as the Christ who altered the frame of the human ontological structure from death to life. Even in the absence of a lexicalized verb, the GIFT-GIVING organizing frame creates a joint attentional triangle between Paul and the audience focused on the resurrected Jesus as the telic embodiment of God’s cosmic salvation. The implied motion is not to move the audience into the presence of God, as prayer is often described, but to represent the actualised presence of θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ within the collective presence of Paul and his audiences.

Paul’s doxologies are consistently presented as participatory responses of gratitude for the human entailment in the Christ-covenant. They do not express a gratitude borne of mechanical reciprocity, but a teleological reciprocity which emerged from a joy borne of incredulous wonder. For Paul, the ontology of the Christ-covenant was not a mystically mediated adjustment to the human experience, but a genuine and complete replacement which was emerging even as he went about the execution of his mission. Therefore, Paul’s doxologies manifested the life-structured ontology within his own sensorimotor

66 Though strictly beyond the scope of this thesis, this is most explicit in the prescripts to Romans and 1 Corinthians through the parallel use of the χαλάσας image and its implied motion. Cf. Barclay, The Gift, 332, “Paul rebukes the Galatians for deserting the one who “called you in the grace of Christ” (τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ, 1:6). A few verses later, he describes his own experience as one set apart before birth whom God “called through his grace” (καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 1:15). In both cases, theirs and his (Gentile and Jewish), the “calling” is an act of divine gift or favor, enacted in the announcement or the revelation of Christ.”
experience, and so were intended to heighten the audiences’ eager, but patient, anticipation of the telic event of the covenant—the physical presence of the resurrected Jesus accompanied by the resurrection of believers into an eternally life-structured ontology.
As shown above and in the following chapter, Paul’s dualistic images of the human person and the concept of word magic require some comment. These two issues highlight the claim of this study that Paul’s seminal communicative problem was explaining that the world which remains ontically susceptible to death is the same ontological structure from which death has been eradicated. Yet, both issues can be addressed by considering the limits of embodied cognition and language.

The impression that Paul held some sort of dualistic view of the human person is particularly created in Gal 6:18, Phil 4:23, and Phlm 25 by the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. The binary exegetical choice between a strictly metaphoric interpretation and accepting that Paul held a dualistic view of the human person can be avoided by two principles: 1) Metaphor (and hyperbole) are necessary to communicate meaning that transcends sensorimotor capacity; 2) Paul’s prayer language is framed by the Christ-narrative. It is possible that blessing the human spirit, which is not visible, partially maps the fact that the telic event of the Christ-narrative remains unseen. However, the fact that the promise of eternal physical life is grounded in the physical resurrection and parousia of Jesus prohibits dualism because a spirit cannot avoid death or be resurrected. It may be that the limits of embodiment sometimes require the use of dualistic references to the human person which do not necessitate an actual belief in an ontological duality. Fortunately, those same limits also allow such usage.1

In terms of word magic, the limits of embodiment necessitate describing transformative events in substantive terms so that the potential experience can be sufficiently concretized as discrete from the individual.2 However, the substantive constructs are not equal to emotions or circumstances, but are metonymies for complex sequences of events idiosyncratically evaluated by individuals in terms of their mental schemas that are prototypically connected to these ideas through prior experience. Again, it is the specificity of the Christ-narrative that prevents the ontological powers represented by χάρις, εἰρήνη, κοινωνία, and ἀγάπη from being equated with word magic, particularly the compression of Cause-Effect into the singular event of the bodily resurrection of Jesus.

1 As Juarrero points out, even though complex systems are contextually constrained by virtue of their organisation, the interdependence imposed by context-sensitive constraints “offers the advantage of permitting unlimited message variety despite limited channel capacity,” Dynamics, 138.

Therefore, χάρις, εἰρήνη, κοινωνία, and ἀγάπη are metonymic anchors available to the audience creates the impression of direct access and global insight to Paul’s message through idiosyncratic prototypical compressions between the Christ-covenant and prior experience. The ontological power represented by these concepts is not presented as creating something new, but actualising what has already been wrought, not metaphorically, but literally, in the flesh. Paul’s audience blessings compress space and time to create conceptual blends that approximate the physical presence Jesus, thereby offering the recipients an opportunity to experience that interaction. Though it is a mystery, it is not magic. It is a miracle.
Chapter 9) The Emergent Complexity of Paul’s Curse Language

This chapter examines Ostmeyer’s conclusion that, “Die Verfluchung ist ein Extremfall der Hinwendung des Menschen zu Gott.”¹ In agreement with Ostmeyer, this analysis considers Paul’s curses to be prayer language because his intention was always redemptive.² The argument in this chapter is a variation of the main theme in this thesis—the distinct redemptive nature of Paul’s curse language reflects the emergent level of complexity necessitated by the claims of the Christ-narrative. Therefore, identifying the prototypical connections between his curses and the Christ-narrative is imperative due to the high scale of emotion inherent in curse language, and the fact that Paul invoked curses against both active and potential threats. However, it is argued here that the significance of his curses is not necessarily dependent on identifying potential opponents. For Paul, the scaled emotive value of the curses is proportional to his certainty in the emergence of the telic event of the Christ-narrative and the fact that, “Außerhalb des Kommunikationsraumes ist nichts als Heillosigkeit.”³

The first section contextualises Paul’s curse language as an ancient ECIN through the work of Anne Marie Kitz and Hudson McLean.⁴ The second section describes it as a function of prototypical embodied cognition. The remainder of the chapter examine the embodied cognitive aspects of ἀνάθεμα, μὴ γένοιτο, and Paul’s oaths as his effort to change the spatiotemporal identity of some within the community from Außerhalb des Kommunikationsraumes to Innerhalb.⁵

9.1) Curses and Apotropaic Rituals as an Ancient ECINs

Anne Marie Kitz shows that Ancient Near Eastern curses were not “insults or offensive language,” but protective instruments which maintained social order as “petitions to the divine world to render judgment and execute harm on identified hostile forces.”⁶ A

---

¹ Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 70.
² Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 69.
⁵ The κατάρα word group is not included because Paul does not use it in the direct issuance of a curse.
⁶ Kitz, Cursed, 3.
proactive curse was used against a potential hostility. It was conditional in that it employed conditional statements to delimit the activation of an otherwise latent judgment. Oaths are included in this category as proactive self-curses.7 Furthermore, Kitz shows a connection between the intended temporal limits of a proactive curse and the durability and visibility of the material upon which it was recorded.8 A reactive curse was an exorcism designed to restore order by driving away an active adversary, nullify its effects, and banish it to its place of origin or to the wilderness. It was unconditional because it invoked a divine agent to counter an identified active adversary without any proviso.9 Kitz says, effectively, curses functioned as implied blessings which created and maintained boundaries between those who were vulnerable to antagonism and an array of ever-present threats.10

For this project, Kitz’ categories require three caveats. First, the categorical demarcations are not mutually exclusive because the characteristics she attributes to unconditional reactive curses could be latent in proactive conditional curses. For example, reactive curses imply that some proviso has already been met since the identification and confirmation of an active adversary depends on conditionality. Second, modal future verbs do not indicate a less-certain optative mood for curses.11 Third, the lack of a direct reference to a divine agent does not necessarily denote a secular statement nor indicate a belief in word magic.12 Even so, the main problem does not lie with Kitz, but with Paul. His claim that the Christ-narrative describes a restructured ontology for human existence in which death does not exist while acknowledging that the ontic human existence is, indeed, threatened by death at every moment makes each of his curses simultaneously reactive and proactive. Yet, the labels are analytically beneficial because either one may be more dominant within a curse blend.

Hudson McLean shows that apotropaic rituals were foundational to first century Mediterranean society because of the belief that a curse could only be banished by a real

7 See Kitz, Cursed, 22–25 for Hebrew Bible scholars who affirm her opinion.
8 Kitz, Cursed, 246. Note the modern validity metaphor, “It is (is not) written in stone.”
9 Kitz, Cursed, 79–82, 246.
10 Kitz, Cursed, 4, 75–79.
11 Contra Kitz, Cursed, 4, 64. See optativity discussion in chapter even.
and material transference of the curse. He says this is the seminal concept of Paul’s assertions that Christ became the curse and became sin on behalf of humanity (Gal 3:13, 2 Cor 5:21, Rom 5:6–10). As an apotropaic sacrifice, the death and burial of Jesus materially transferred the curse of death from humanity to Christ by embodying the logical functions of the apotropaic ritual—the annihilation and removal of the curse.

McLean’s work supports the present claim that the significance of the Christ-narrative cannot be overstated. It created a new conceptual space related to the apotropaic ritual which served as the cognitive foundation to Christianity and Paul’s use of curses. For Paul, the ritual had purified humanity beyond question. However, at least two active threats remained—unbelief, which prevented those so disposed from benefiting from the ritual, and disunity among believers, which emanated from a failure to understand the implications of the ritual and act accordingly. While neither of these threats were indicative of the efficaciousness of the ritual, they were serious threats to the solidarity within the faith communities as obstacles to participation in the Christ-covenant. Thus, Paul’s curses were unconditional bans issued with an apotropaic intention which combine “an assertion about Jesus Christ with self-involvement on the part of the speaker.”

9.2) Prototypical Curse Blends, Embodiment, and Paul’s Gospel

Curses compress space, time, and identity into boundaries framed by the generic spaces SAMENESS and BINARY OPPOSITION which create the impression of direct access and global insight into prototypical organising frames such as SAFETY, DANGER, SACRED, and PROFANE. Curses also compress the identity of the issuer and the invoked deity to equate the speech act of the human agent with the presence of the deity and the activation of divine power against a perceived adversary or adversarial event. Counter factual thinking determines whether a curse is proactive or reactive by identifying a state or event which is not currently in existence. Thus, the identity of a potential or active threat is compressed


14 For another argument that Paul utilized the general belief in curses see John Fotopoulos, “Paul’s Curse of Corinthians: Restraining Rivals with Fear and Voces Mysticae (1 Cor 16:22),” NovT 56.3 (2014), 275–309.

15 Contra McLean, Cursed Christ, 143, an apotropaic paradigm does not necessitate a binary choice between solidarity and substitution.

16 Thiselton’s description of the confessions in 1 Cor 12:3, Corinthians, 918. However, contra Thiselton, it is not the case that neither Paul nor the OT had “a recognized procedure for ‘unblessing’ or ‘uncursing.’” Corinthians, 399.
with an object, event, or person to create a prototypical recipient identity. Any characteristics of the actual issuer or recipient which resist the binary conditions of the curse are not necessarily mapped into the emergent blend. Time is always perfective, even in conditional curse, because efficaciousness is assumed at issuance. Even though they ultimately depend upon divine action, the emotive power of curses is proportional to the level of affirmation invested in these compressions. Again, the limits of embodied cognition create the paradox that even though curses are not an exact representation of the world, they do manifest in an *us-versus-them* physicality. Therefore, in curse blends, the devil is truly in the details of the specific religious framing narrative from which it emerges.

9.3) ἀνάθεμα as an Apotropaic Unconditional Ban

This analysis of Paul’s use of ἀνάθεμα in Rom 9:3, 1 Cor 12:3, Gal 1:8–9, and 1 Cor 16:22 situates the blends within the paradigm of apotropaic unconditional bans. Technically, Rom 9:3 and 1 Cor 12:3 are prayer reports containing ἀνάθεμα, but it is expeditious to include them here.

A) The Punctiliar Impression Problem of ἀνάθεμα in Rom 9:3

The difficulty with Paul’s use of ἀνάθεμα in Rom 9:3 is that it can give the impression of a punctiliar and final event, as evidence by Moo’s reasonable question, “Would Paul actually have prayed that he be eternally damned so that others could be saved?”17 This problem is resolved by understanding the degree to which Paul integrated himself and his missionary activity into the Christ-narrative. Paul consistently used the sufferings of Christ as an identity marker for himself and the prototypical believer.18 For example, he defined the status of a co-heir with Christ as sharing in the sufferings of Christ (Rom 8:17) and expressed his own desire to participate in the κοινωνία of Christ’s suffering (Phil 3:10). He even equated his sufferings with those of Christ, and claimed that his sufferings provide commensurate παράκλησις for his audience (2 Cor 1:50). Finally, there is the remark, Τοῦ λοιποῦ κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω (Gal 6:17).


Therefore, Paul’s self-ἀνάθεμα prayer is his logical apostolic participation in the Christ-narrative. The imperfect ἡγχόμην does not signify a past desire or a hypothetical case which Paul knew to be impossible. As much as Christ became ἀνάθεμα for the sake of unbelieving humanity, Paul was willing to become ἀνάθεμα for the sake of unbelieving Jews. The prayer is a reactive unconditional curse issued against the active and identifiable threat of unbelief among the Jews.

Objections to Paul’s view of himself as a potential apotropaic sacrifice do not account for the role of physical resurrection in Paul’s economy of salvation. The sufferings of Christ map the resurrection of Jesus, not his death, as the telic manifestation of the apotropaic ritual which eternally restructured the cosmic ontology. The self-ἀνάθεμα blend does not map eternal separation from Christ. It maps the separation represented by death and the grave, a separation destroyed by the resurrection. Paul’s apostolic self-ἀνάθεμα participation in the Christ-narrative entailed a surety regarding his own resurrection. Paul’s concept of salvation was not a disembodied existence in a heavenly realm. Whatever else it meant to Paul, as the subject of his desires and prayers, salvation always included physical resurrection as the teleological order of growth. Hence, the reason that the implied motion in Paul’s conceptualization of his mission consistently moves from death to resurrection. One of the most explicit examples is 2 Cor 4:7–15, which crescendos with the declaration: εἰδότες δὲ ἐγείρας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν. τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι’ ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων τὴν εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

The relationship between the self-ἀνάθεμα prayer and the prayer report in Rom 10:1 is more than parallel evidence of Paul’s emotional investment in the salvation of his fellow Jews. The self-ἀνάθεμα blend is Paul’s ultimate expression of his self-identity with Christ. It does not merely combine a confession about Jesus with a speech act of self-involvement. It is an embodiment of his confession, ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (Gal 2:20). This testimony cannot be adequately understood as a mechanical order of punctiliar cause-effect. Like the self-ἀνάθεμα prayer, it can only be understood in terms of the complexity inherent in living in an emerging life-structured ontology while surrounded by a death-structured ontic experience.
B) The Trouble with Binary Opposites and Metonymies in 1 Cor 12:3

The assumption here is that the phrase Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς was being used by some members of the community. However, it is not necessary to imagine an organized group which could properly be labelled ‘the Ἀνάθεμα party.’ Rather, it is possible that Paul responded to the speech act for reasons other than its binary opposition to the phrase Κύριος Ἰησοῦς. Even though the two phrases are metonymies for people who advocated different theological positions based on the same Christ-narrative, the exact relationship between these emergent properties and the actual situation in the faith community cannot be stated with certainty. This is important to keep in mind because presuppositions about the actual situation do determine some aspects of interpretation. For example, if one imagines an active argument between two somewhat organised factions, then Paul’s argument will most likely be viewed as an aggressive attack on the Ἀνάθεμα party.

According to Thiselton, one problem with this conception is that, in the context of first-century curses, Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς is self-evidently contradictory.¹⁹ Paul’s rebuke would be banal. Second, the contextual phrases of speaking ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ and ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ suggest that the utterance could represent a compression of a larger argument that purported an advanced theological sophistry. In this case, Paul’s binary opposition does not necessitate delineating two groups of people, but adjudicating between two conceptual mental spaces claiming the status of a prototypical verbum Dei for Christ-covenant participation. This does not deny that actual people were using the phrase and causing an actual disturbance in the community. Rather, it considers whether Paul’s first concern was to banish the people who were using the phrase, or to banish the phrase and redeem the people.

Obviously, for Paul, the phrase Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς constituted an anti-Christ-covenant. However, based upon mental spaces created by the previous two verses—Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν, ἀδέλφοι, οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. Οἶδατε ὅτι ὅτε ἔθηκε ἃπαντα ἰσότοιον (12:1–2)—two possibilities should be considered.²⁰ First, Paul’s main concern was that those who were convinced of the Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς argument were committing themselves to a Christological antithesis which was beyond their

¹⁹ See Thiselton, Corinthians, 909–927 for a summary of the debate on the setting of the confessions.

²⁰ For the necessity of including at least 12:2 in the interpretation of this passage see Bruce W. Winter, After Paul Left Corinth: The Influences of Secular Ethics and Social Change (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 182.
comprehension. Second, he approached his argument from the presumption that the result of their theological sophistry was, in fact, antithetical to their desire.

Notice that 12:2 compresses the entirety of Gentile religion as a deceptive worldview intentionally created through the propaganda of oracles as genuine products of idols. This systemic intentional deception mitigates the responsibility of the prototypical Gentile in the blend. Οἴδατε suggests this was a mutual agreement between Paul and his audience. By characterizing Gentile religion as the process by which they were intentionally kept ignorant, Paul characterizes Christian worship as an intentional process of obtaining true knowledge. The ἔθνη are those who are led astray. Christians are those who are empowered to discern for themselves.

In 12:1, Paul sets himself in opposition to the Gentile religious system by claiming that he is honest and transparent about spiritual events. Therefore, the knowledge Paul is imparting is intended to protect and strengthen them by affirming their religious identity, and thereby preventing them from being led astray. The judgment Paul gave the audience was that Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς could not be charismatic speech because God can speak, unlike Gentile idols. The difference was in kind, not degree. Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς was unholy because it placed idols within the same conceptual space as God.

This allows the possibility that, in 12:3, the ignorance-by-deception suffered by the ἔθνη is mapped onto Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς. Then, the binary opposition of Κύριος Ἰησοῦς evokes the mental schema of a choice made available to the ἔθνη for escaping the deceptive system. Rather than a summary condemnation of those who were advocating the Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς argument, this verse represents an opportunity to avoid the condemnation of deception. This presents a picture of Paul emerges which is not angry or castigating, but deeply troubled over an active threat against the people.

Yet, the relationship between 12:1–2 and 14:37–38 illustrates Paul’s understanding of the ultimate connection between attitudes and the people who hold them.21 Not only is the abstract space of τῶν πνευματικῶν in 12:1 brought into relief by Εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης ἐίναι ἢ πνευματικὸς (14:37a), the second part of the verse presents the parameters for choosing between spirituality versus ignorance and deception. The implication is that rejecting the parameters equals complicity in the threat and removes any mitigation provided by 12:1–

21 Thiselton notes 12:1–2 “set the stage for a dialectic between solidarity and differentiation” which runs through 14:40, Corinthians, 911. Italics original.
2. Though not determinative, this analysis prefers that the textual variant ἁγνοεῖτω in 1 Cor 14:38 as part of the unconditional apotropaic ban. While the immediate threat to the community can be isolated and analysed conceptually, acting to disarm the threatening concepts is an embodied act, which entails volition. This analysis considers Paul’s emotive scale towards banning the phrase to be unconditional and non-negotiable. Therefore, whoever ignored his letter remained ignorant and deceived, thereby embodying the threat, and so must also embody the ban. The passion with which he discharged his apostolic responsibility reveals not only that the embodiment of the ban would be their own self-identifying choice, but also that his urgent desire was for them to know that they had the choice and the ability to choose well.

C) Redemption or Vengeance? ἀνάθεμα ἔστω in Gal 1:8–9

It is difficult to imagine a higher level of intensity than the parallel use of ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Unquestionably, some message was spreading through Galatia which Paul perceived as an active threat to the core of the Christ-covenant. The interest here is not to characterize Paul’s self-involvement in the curses vis-à-vis his relationship to the agitators, but with the thesis that his prayer language was consistently guided by the principle of solidarity inherent in the restructured ontology of the Christ-covenant. Regardless of the identity of the purveyors, the ‘other’ gospel had to somehow deny the active emergence of a life-structured ontology which would inevitably be fully manifested in the realm of sensorimotor perception.

Again, anger is not necessarily the primary emotive prompt for Paul’s curse. Regardless of how he felt, his mission dictated that an unconditional apotropaic ban was the necessary course of action in response to the threat. The counterfactual idea is that the curse would be lifted if the action were reversed. If, however, the action is not reversed, the only recourse is to banish the person(s) involved. This places the agitators within Paul’s cognitive space of ἀδελφοί, the very term he used to address the Galatians, even though they had turned away from his gospel and he was again in the pains of childbirth so that

22 early \(\text{𝔓𝔓}_46, \text{B}, \text{Db,c} [\text{A}^2]\), most later MSS.

23 Hans Dieter Betz makes the important observation that Paul does not address the agitators directly, but focuses on the effects of the agitation, Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 5.

24 If the agitators’ identity is significant, Dunn’s argument for “Christian-Jewish missionaries who had come to Galatia to improve or correct Paul’s gospel,” seems convincing. James D. G. Dunn, The Epistle to the Galatians, BNTC 9 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 9–11.
Christ would be formed in them. This is evidence that Paul viewed the entire epistle as an exercise in restoring anyone προλημφθῇ ἐν τιν παραπτώματι ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος. 25

Given the mitigation of ignorance for those who uttered Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, and his self-ἀνάθεμα prayer, Paul’s desire for restoration could have easily extended to the agitators. 26

Like the discussion above, this has significant implications for understanding the ‘wish-curse’ in 5:12—δέφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ύμᾶς—typically viewed as an afterthought, or “a final sarcastic and dismissive snort” aimed at the agitators. 27 The alternative proposal here is to construe 5:11b–12 as a recasting of the ἀνάθεμα curse in 1:8–9. The idea is not to deny or soften the imagery evoked by the term ἀποκόψονται, but to partially map the grizzly act onto the ‘other’ gospel which gives κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ a graphic and paradoxical embodiment. In terms of circumcision, the scandal of the cross emerges as granting salvation to the Gentiles as they were embodied, with nothing cut away. In terms of embodiment, the uncircumcised were whole and the circumcised were not. The castrated were not whole because they were bereft of procreating. The import is that a gospel insisting on circumcision castrated the cross by rendering it incapable of giving life as it is.

Therefore, ἀποκόψονται is not a random or vengeful image cast upon the agitators, but the logical end of their gospel. Paul’s desire for the agitators to self-anathematize is emotively equivalent to his own self-ἀνάθεμα prayer in Rom 9:3. The difference is that Paul’s self-ἀνάθεμα compressed his identity with Christ’s as an apotropaic sacrifice, while Gal 5:12 compresses the identity of the circumcision preachers into the role of antichrist activity. Just as the dominical instructions on self-mutilation in response to sin were not strictly literal, and the destruction of the flesh in 1 Cor 5 could signify something other than physical death, 28 Ambrosiaster’s comment on Gal 5:12 should be given due consideration:

25 Though the concept of gentleness is often associated with πραΰτης, it seems best to frame Paul’s use with the BDAG definition, “the quality of not being overly impressed by a sense of one’s self-importance.”

26 Note Barclay’s general assessment of Galatians, “its arguments and appeals are intended not just to inform its recipients about this grace, but to place them within its transformative dynamic,” The Gift, 331. Furthermore, Paul’s self-involvement in the curse as evidence for the inviolable nature of the Christ-covenant is undermined by interpreting ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕαν as the impossibility of Paul or an angel perpetrating such an act.

27 Betz, Galatians, 270. Dunn, Galatians, 282. The morphology of δέφελον is disputed, as is whether it denotes an unattainable wish. See discussion on optativity in chapter seven.

28 See Anthony Thiselton, “Meaning of Sarx in 1 Corinthians 5:5: A Fresh Approach in the Light of Logical and Semantic Factors,” SJT 26.2 (1973): 204–228. For the argument that the curse was intended to cause the physical death of the perpetrator, and though the man is declared to be saved, neither the curse nor his death
“[The point is] that those who had deprived the Galatians of the grace of God should themselves be cut off from the grace of God.”29 The opinion here is slightly adjusted. For Paul, those who had deprived the Galatians of the grace of God were ipso facto cut off from life. They just did not know it.30

This fundamental contrast between the ignorance of the agitators and Paul’s intentional self-involvement in the ἀνάθεμα curse gives significant meaning to the letter as an integrated unit. If Paul violated the Christ-covenant, he knew he would be cut off. The agitators were dead men walking, and spreading their gangrenous ignorance with each step. However, the inviolability of the Christ-covenant necessitates the counterfactual scenario of restitution (i.e. resurrection) for the agitators if they were to cut themselves off from the false gospel. As employed by Paul, the contrast creates a blended space for the epistle which does not map the probability or potentiality of Paul’s violation or the agitators’ restitution. These images represent the extremities of a volitional scale into which Paul projects the condition of his audience. As in Corinth, the fate of the Galatians was dependent upon a choice to which they had access. Paul was simply, though passionately, giving them a reasonable picture of where they currently stood without becoming self-undermining or denying the obvious.

D) Reading 1 Cor 16:22 as an Unconditional Reactive Ban

Of all the ἀνάθεμα curses, 1 Cor 16:22 creates the most sense of a conditional proactive curse intended to cover an unspecified number of future conditions because of the uncertain relationship to μαράνα θά, its position at the end of the letter, and the unusual occurrence of φιλέω. This analysis reads ἤτω ἀνάθεμα as an unconditional reactive ban based on Margaret Mitchell’s assessment that the entire letter “represents the fundamental problem of practical ecclesiology” emerging from the church as “a real political body.”31 For her, this affirms Paul’s use of deliberative rhetoric and Graeco-Roman political terms was salvific see David Raymond Smith, ‘Hand This Man Over to Satan’: Curse, Exclusion and Salvation in 1 Corinthians 5, LNTS 386 (London: T&T Clark, 2008).

29 CSEL, 81.3:57–58 (ACCS NT 8:80).

30 Barclay, The Gift, 332, “[In Galatians] “Christ” and “grace” (associated by assonance in Greek: Χριστός and χάρις) are rhetorically and logically merged: to lose one is to lose the other,”332.

31 Margaret M. Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 300. Per Thistlethon, the form ἤτω is a late alternative form for ἔστω and should not be cause for over analysis, Corinthians, 1352.
and concepts. As an alternative, the following analysis describes the potential teleological order of growth in which the church emerged as a real political body in the context of Paul’s mission.

Anders Eriksson convincingly argues that ἰτω ἀνάθεμα and μαράνα θά are inextricably linked as a single construct rooted in pre-Pauline traditional covenant language. The parousia invoked by μαράνα θά elicited the curse so that 1 Cor 16:13–24 recapitulates the entire letter and achieves its ethical and emotional climax in verse 22. He enlists the ancient rhetorical practice of “non-naming or periphrasis” to claim that the coupling of the curse and the prayer singled out Corinthian pneumatics who had an over-realized eschatology, and to explain how the audience would have identified the intended referents. While possible, the argument above is repeated here, namely that the specific identity of the violators is not necessary for the blend. Yet, Eriksson’s observation is compatible with the main thesis here that Paul’s prayer language is consistently organised by the specificity of the Christ-narrative.

In this case, the curse is organised by that narrative with an even more specific focus on the emergence of the parousia. In this frame, the blend does not create a proactive conditional curse containing a prototypical violator who actualises the conditions of the curse upon an unspecified future act. Like the uses of ἀνάθεμα analysed above, μαράνα θά combines a confession about Jesus with a speech act of self-involvement. Thus, the prayer simultaneously proclaims the parousia as the telic event of the Christ-covenant, and functions as a speech act which denotes the positive desire of the speaker to experience it. Not only does μαράνα θά elicit ἀνάθεμα, the apotropaic function of ἀνάθεμα is an active anticipation for μαράνα θά. The reactive nature of the ἀνάθεμα curse is predicated on the idea that the parousia was not only inevitable, but inherently desirable. In fact, the emotive power of μαράνα θά is directly proportional to both, which raises the issue of the setting for the prayer.

While the epistolary position of the curse is significant, there is no need to imagine a liturgical function along the line of Witherington’s opinion that the collocation of ἀνάθεμα

---

32 Anders Eriksson, Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians, ConBNT 29 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998). Initially, μαράνα θά was considered an independent prayer blend.

33 Eriksson, Traditions, 284–298. Central to Eriksson’s method is that ancient rhetoric began at points of agreement, or at least familiarity, between speaker and audience (inventio). Persuasion was achieved through rational argument (Logos), the character of the speaker and the ethics of the speech (Ethos), and emotional appeal (Pathos). Eriksson contends that Paul use of tradition in 1 Cor variously fits all the categories.
and μαράνα θά indicates that “the curse formula would be followed in the worship service by the plea for the Lord to come as judge and act on the curse.” Instead, the epistolary position of the prayer indicates that it compresses all the action, explicit and implicit, in the Christ-narrative into a singular emergent telic event. The emotive and inspirational value of the prayer is prompting the community to evaluate itself as a collective member of a complex adaptive religious system which is emerging towards sensorimotor synchronicity.

The final problem with 1 Cor 16:22 is that the counterfactual behaviour is identified with the abstract condition εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον. Because this is the only instance of φιλέω in the undisputed letters, and the term only appears otherwise in Tit 3:15, it does seem a bit surprising, even from a cognitive linguistic perspective. Fee interprets this to mean that Paul’s main concern is “not their obedience to his word, but their love, or lack thereof, for the Lord himself.” The possibility raised here is that the phrase φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον was a self-designation among early believers. As Dunn aptly states, “Self-identification by reference not only to Jesus, but to Jesus as Lord, constituted a massive step in the basic self-understanding of the early disciple groups.”

Here again Eriksson is helpful. His concept of Paul as a transmitter of Christian tradition led him to observe that the ἀνάθεμα curse in Gal 1:9 is against those who contradict what has already been received. Though he does not make the connection, this allows a common context with 1 Cor 16:22 to support the idea that both φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον and μαράνα θά were constituent pieces of pre-Pauline tradition. Just as μαράνα θά is thought to be well known to the Corinthians, the entire statement makes the most sense if φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον was a well-recognized pre-Pauline self-designation. Then, similar to 1 Cor 12:3, the prayer creates the human scale scenario in which the content of the Christ-narrative

34 Ben Witherington III, Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 323. Also, see Thiselton, Corinthians, 1348–1350 for why the opinion that the μαράνα θά prayer served as an opening to a Eucharistic liturgy has been abandoned.

35 Fee, Corinthians, 838.

36 Eriksson nor anyone else suggests that the phrase φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον reflects a pre-Pauline, or at least extra-Pauline, tradition.


38 This would highlight the fact that Paul considered his epistle to be reflective of universal truth regardless of contingency (Cf., 1 Cor 11:16).
which was either being rejected outright, or unwittingly rejected by contradictory behavior, and compresses it into the telic scenario of the parousia. Regardless of the details, the point remains that denying the embodied teleology of the Christ-covenant in any manner would equate to not loving the Lord, and that would be the threat which would necessitate an apotropaic ritual.

9.4) \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) as an Apotropaic Unconditional Ban

This section analyses \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) as Paul’s unconditional ban with apotropaic intentions that parallel his use of \( \acute{\alpha}n \acute{a} \delta \epsilon \mu \alpha \). Yet, \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) has a higher emotive scale because it indicated that the integrity of Paul’s entire mission was at stake. The phrase appears fourteen times across only three Pauline letters: Romans (3:4, 3:6, 3:31, 6:2, 6:15, 7:7, 7:13, 9:14, 11:1, 11:11), 1 Corinthians (6:15), and Galatians (2:17, 3:21, 6:14). Prior to the analysis, the work of Stanley Stowers and Abraham Malherbe on Paul’s use of the diatribe in Romans requires some comment concerning the relationship between the rhetorical device and his use of \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \).  

A) Paul’s Use of \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) and the Rhetoric of Diatribe

Stowers and Malherbe shared a common concern to temper Bultmann’s influential opinion that Paul’s use of \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) betrayed a lack of rational rigour and an over-dependence on emotion, especially as compared to Epictetus. They both claimed that, except Rom 3:31, Paul consistently used \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) as a transitional phrase for introducing and emphasising a highly developed rational process of argumentation. Stowers went so far as saying that any exegesis of Romans which fails to recognise the importance of \( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) in the structure and development of the entire epistle is innately incomplete.

---

39 Dieter Georgi makes the argument that the collection in 1 Cor 16:1–4 was Paul’s direct counter to the “mystery cliques and esoteric circles which threatened his congregations,” Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul’s Collection for Jerusalem, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), 52. For Georgi, the collection was a unifying effort meant to bind the Pauline churches to the historical Christ event centred in Jerusalem, in part, to counter the Corinthians over-realized eschatology. For the full argument see 50–54.

40 Gal 6:14 is addressed as an oath in section 9.5.

41 See Stanley K. Stowers, The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter to the Romans, SBLDS 57 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 199–154, and Abraham J. Malherbe, “\( \mu \acute{e} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \omega \tau \omicron \) in the Diatribe and Paul,” HTR 73 (1980): 231–240. Both conclude that Paul’s use of diatribe was consistent enough with ancient rhetorical practice to be recognised as such, and yet adapted to the point that it must be analysed on its own merit.


43 Stowers, Diatribe, 154.
This analysis confirms that μὴ γένοιτο was not an arbitrary response, but a logical necessity. However, the goal is to describe μὴ γένοιτο within a logical paradigm that does not deny the extreme emotion inherent in the phrase by showing that the emotive and logical forces were co-dependent emergent properties of the human capacity for conceptualising an unthinkable situation or circumstance. In this approach, it is inconsequential to determine if the phrase countered actual opinions of active opponents, misinterpretations of otherwise well-intentioned teachers, or potential misgivings of a fictional interlocutor. Even if Paul raised some of the questions via a fictional interlocutor, μὴ γένοιτο resulted from his perception of a real danger posed by the possibility of someone thinking the unthinkable. Therefore, it cannot be relegated to a rhetorical devise employed as a summary dismissal of unimportant or impotent issues, or a response to hypothetical absurdities. Rather, μὴ γένοιτο was Paul’s reasoned emotional defence of the community from what he perceived to be significant threats that were either currently active or legitimately potential.

Regardless of how Paul may have employed the diatribe, the force of μὴ γένοιτο extended beyond argumentation. The implied motion is casting away with extreme force and prejudice. As such, the translation “May it never be” is too passive to communicate the passion of this curse, whether it is considered reactive or proactive. It may be impossible to translate the phrase adequately, but Thiselton’s translation, “Perish the very thought!” does have the force of expelling, and places the emphasis on banning the conceptual content.

As with ἀνάθεμα, it is important to maintain an awareness that μὴ γένοιτο is not necessarily reflective of personal disdain. As Stowers points out, “In censuring a certain theological interpretation Paul’s concern is also a certain type of behaviour.” Except the fact that the classroom image and the term pedagogical lack the emotion which is evident in the ban, his comments on Rom 3:1–9 provide a good analogy for understanding μὴ γένοιτο:

44 e.g. See Douglas Campbell’s intricate reconstruction of the diatribe, “Romans 3:1–20—The Taming of the Teacher,” in The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 571–587. The point here is that an embodied hermeneutic can describe μὴ γένοιτο as Paul’s own “anthropocentric construal” of the “christocentric mysticism” that was his gospel without reconstructing an interlocutor or reducing Paul’s gospel to a forensic construal. See Campbell, Deliverance of God, 1.

45 Thiselton, Corinthians, 466.

46 Stowers, Diatribe, 148. Of Epictetus’ use of objections and false conclusions, Stowers writes, “The purpose of this sort of discourse is not simply to convey information, but to bring about the transformation of persons,” 138.
The objections in 3:1–9 and elsewhere should not be thought of as aimed at Jews as opponents, but rather as addressed to the Roman church in the mode of indictment or censure. Their intent is not polemical but pedagogical. In using these objections from various groups, it is as if Paul were instructing a classroom of Jews and various sorts of Christians in the gospel and its implications.47

The critical analogical point is that Paul’s main concern was not securing a victory over his opponents. Similarly, if μὴ γένοιτο is given its full emotive and pedagogical weight, then the false conclusions which engendered the response must have been directly contradictory to the gospel and its implications. However, the scholarly focus on Paul’s adversaries tends to obscure the possibility that his curses are directed towards the threats created by the attitudes and actions within the communities of believers. Therefore, the question here is not who presented the false conclusions, or how they were derived, but why they were potentially so tragic?

B) μὴ γένοιτο and Threats to the Christ-Narrative

The primary concern here is not the rationality of μὴ γένοιτο in relation to the structural integrity of a specific epistle or passage, but the rational emotion which motivated Paul to use it. One approach is to infer, from the context, possible questions that elicited the response, and look for potential prototypical connections between them. The following list contains verse references for μὴ γένοιτο, and possible questions paraphrased from the context.

Rom 3:4 — Does the unfaithfulness of some nullify the faithfulness of God?

Rom 3:6 — Is God unjust in the execution of his judgement?

Rom 3:31 — Is the law overthrown by the principle of faith?

Rom 6:2 — Should sin be encouraged so that grace can grow in abundance?

Rom 6:15 — Does the absence of the Law encourage sin?

Rom 7:7 — Is the Law to be equated with sin?

Rom 7:13 — Did the holy, just, and good Law bring death to humanity?

Rom 9:14 — Is God unjust?

47 Stowers, Diatribe, 153.
Rom 11:1 — Has God rejected his people Israel?

Rom 11:11 — Has Israel stumbled and fallen away from God?

Gal 2:17 — If those following Christ are found to be sinners, is Christ a servant of sin?

Gal 3:21 — Is the Law opposed to God’s promises?

1 Cor 6:15 — Can the members of Christ be transformed into members of a prostitute?

Aligned this way, most of the μὴ γένοιτο responses are contextualised by discussions concerning the Law. This may indicate a consistent problem in his audiences’ understanding of the nature and purpose of the Law. It is also possible that some of those questions represent Paul’s own intellectual development in relation to the Christ-covenant. Either way, from Paul’s perspective, the misunderstanding and misappropriation of the Law was an ever-present threat. Two immediate questions are presented. If Christ was the fulfilment of the Law, why would Paul consider it necessary to preserve the integrity of the Law? Correlatively, how could Paul think that his position on circumcision was not inconsistent with such preservation?

The answers involve two controls upon Paul’s thought: the absolute holiness of God, and the integrative hermeneutic of the Christ-narrative and the historic narrative in the Hebrew scriptures. God’s holiness renders it unthinkable for God to be culpable in any possible scenario. The fairness, justice, equity, and consistency with which God speaks and acts is essential to his very being. The least compromise means theological annihilation so that a binary opposition of God’s law and God’s promises creates an untenable contradiction in the character of God. Correlatively, equating the Law with sin, or its absence with encouraging sin, or its existence with death, means the Law cannot be holy, good, or just, and, by extension, neither can God. If God is not holy, good, and just, he cannot be trusted to bring salvation. Secondly, unless the integrative hermeneutic maintains Israel’s election, then either the original divine covenant was not founded on a promise, in which case the scriptures constitute a lie, or God broke his covenant and he is, again, untrustworthy. The context of Rom 3:3 is quite telling. Paul maintains that circumcision and the Law signify God’s faithfulness, not the faithfulness of those who received them.
Therefore, if Israel stumbled so as to fall away from God in its entirety, that would constitute unfaithfulness on the part of God.\footnote{Cf., Barclay, *The Gift*, 547, “His own role as “apostle of the Gentiles” features prominently, but there is more at stake here than self-promotion or an apologetic claim that his Gentile mission is oriented for, and not against, the salvation of Israel. We seem to strike here on a logic that finds in the success of the Gentile mission an indication that the momentum of mercy will finally enfold also Israel itself.”}

The concept of a promissory covenant is negated if the Law is overthrown by faith, or if sin is encouraged so that grace can grow in abundance, because either condition represents a mechanism of linear causality which is non-personal and, therefore, non-binding, or better, non-bonding. The defining character of a promissory covenant is not legal binding, but relational bonding—an ontological bonding which supersedes intellectual assent to prescribed relational ethics. Relational bonding entails a transformation that is, in its logical form, a teleological order of growth. The presupposition that the original divine covenant constituted a teleologically ordered ontological bonding anchored in the absolute holiness of God is the generic space common to all the questions in Romans and Gal 3:21. Each one is a variant manifestation of the same organising query frame (Is God capable of duplicity?) and the same organising answer (μὴ γένοιτο). Evidently, for Paul, anything less would give the question an open metaphysical status.

Because Paul’s faith and ministry was based on the premise that the Christ-narrative was consonant with the scripture inasmuch as it represented the singular integrated telic event of the originating divine covenant which the text depicted, similar teleological principles are elicited by μὴ γένοιτο in Gal 2:17 and 1 Cor 6:15. For Jesus to be the promised Messiah, his life, death, resurrection, and parousia must be in concert with the character and actions of God throughout history. In other words, Paul’s basic understanding of God was predicated on a *Heilsgeschichte* ordered by principles of teleological growth. If the originating covenant created a transformative ontological bond, the telic covenant into which it logically grew must have a commensurate ontological transformative bonding effect. Therefore, risking a bad paraphrase of Ostmeyer’s thought, die Teleologiesphäre der Gottes would necessarily reflect the divine character of absolute holiness. The claim that Jesus was the divinely appointed telos of the Law necessarily entails preserving the integrity of the Law. This is also why Paul’s position on circumcision posed no threat to the integrity of the Law.\footnote{Because his ethical instructions consistently emerged from the implications of the embeddedness of the Christ narrative within the original covenant, it is difficult to escape the idea that Paul had a well-developed eschatological theology prior to his Christological encounter.}
Similarly, for the God of the teleological covenant to be identical to the God of the originating covenant, *die Teleologiesphäre der Gottes* must be cosmic, unrestricted by physical and geo-political boundaries — בְּרֵאשִׁ֖ית בָּרָ֣א אֱֽלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַ֖יִם אֶת הָאָֽרֶץ (Gen 1:1). Yet, unrestricted does not mean disembodied. Here, the conceptual blend in 1 Cor 6:15a is read as a refutation of the axiom πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν in 6:12 which reflects a mechanistic spirituality that is *außerhalb die Heilssphäre der Gottes* because it is a non-personal approach that lacks a teleological relational bonding. Paul’s refutation of such mechanistic spiritual reductionism is a variation of another prototypical theme in his theologising: the self-involvement of embodied action is ontologically more binding than sensorimotor experience can perceive (ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντα συμφέρει and ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγὼ ἔξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπὸ τινός).

This teleological principle of embodied ontology prompted the cross-mapping of the physical bodies of the Corinthians and Jesus with the compression of conceptual body of the community of Corinthian believers and the physical body of the resurrected Christ in 6:15a. The threat to the Corinthian community is not a lack of knowledge about the Christ-covenant, but the manifestation of behaviour which is so blatantly contradictory to the covenant that Paul uses a blend in 6:15b that places the ontological bond of the Christ-covenant in binary opposition to the ontic bond of prostitution. The two are mutually exclusive because the latter is the embodied rejection of the embodied participation in the former. Here, μὴ γένοιτο is much more than an intellectual or rhetorical response to an obvious false conclusion. Nor does it mark a transition in the argument or signal the end of the matter, because it is effectively restated by Φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν (6:18) and δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν (6:20). Rather, μὴ γένοιτο is simultaneously an urgent plea and an authoritative declaration for action based on the concept that the physical purity of the body, individual and corporate, is explicit in the resurrection of the body as the embodiment of the Christ-covenant.

9.5) Oaths as Proactive Conditional Curses

Kitz identifies an oath as a special case proactive conditional curse in which the oath taker incurs the result of the curse if the condition is met. From a CBT perspective, an oath is a conceptual blend that compresses the identity of the oath taker into the unique category of an idealised member of a specific community. This compression is necessary for the oath

---

50 Here בְּרֵאשִׁ֖ית is understood as semantically parallel to Πρῶτον in Rom 1:8, as discussed in chapter six.
to represent the specific boundaries, potential threats, and requisite actions for protecting
the community. This section analyses Paul’s use of oaths as proactive protection of the
integrity of the prototypical believer’s Christ-covenant participation. As such, Paul’s oaths
contain a latent reactivity because they represent his prototypical response to anything or
anyone who threatened to prevent anyone from Christ-covenant participation. To borrow
from C. S. Lewis, the following analysis shows how Paul employed oaths to put himself in
the dock.51

A) μὴ γένοιτο in Gal 6:14: A Special Case of a Special Case

As helpful as Kitz’ categorical distinctions may be, this use of μὴ γένοιτο is a perfect
example of their limits. Here, μὴ γένοιτο functions as an oath and a reactive unconditional
ban. At least three reasons admit it into the oath category. First, the phrase is self-directed.
Therefore, based on the implied apotropaic motion, the phrase is a procedural marker for
inferring the conditions under which Paul would be cast away. Second, inasmuch as the
oath defines his mission, specifically his preaching, as faithful Christ-covenant
participation, boasting in nothing but the cross of Christ also elicits the counterfactual
scenario in which other boasting would threaten his covenant participation. The implied
curse is that any other boasting would place him outside of the covenant. Third, because it
is framed by the Christ-narrative, it is implicitly organized by a DIALOGUE frame which
directs the statement to God as a promissory covenant. Thus, the speech act assumes the
possibility of divine judgment, even while emphatically denying the potential of a future
violation.

It is a reactive unconditional ban because it still functions to counter a false conclusion,
emphasize the corrective instruction, and structure the argument. As in the other uses of
μὴ γένοιτο, the implied curse is primarily aimed at the attitude and behavior which
threatens Paul’s participation in the covenant rather than at Paul as a discrete individual.
While it is possible that he used the oath in response to an accusation that he was
speaking, or acting, in some way that was contradictory to his message, this is, again,
strictly unnecessary for the blend. Here, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ
compresses Paul’s entire existence into the signature sacrificial act of Christ, which retains
the unconditional apotropaic intent of μὴ γένοιτο by organising it within the frame of
Paul’s embodied apostolic identity and authority, absent any accusation to the contrary.

Even though the entire utterance is a circumlocution for some form of the direct locution θεὸς μάρτυς, it invokes God as Paul’s witness inasmuch as God was the divine witness of the crucifixion of Christ. Therefore, the statement as a proactive conditional self-curse which has the power of a reactive unconditional apotropaic ban and the pedagogical function of an exemplar for faithful covenant participation. Like the instructions analysed in the next chapter, the use of μὴ γένοιτο in Gal 6:14 exhibits an exquisitely balanced presentation of humility and power designed to focus the attention of the audience on the telic event which is emerging into the sensorimotor realm of human existence.

B) Calling God as Witness

In four instances, Paul takes an oath via the specific phrase θεὸς μάρτυς (Rom 1:9, 2 Cor 1:23, Phil 1:8, and 1 Thess 2:5). This section includes ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (Gal 1:20) and ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἤδειν (2 Cor 11:31) as circumlocutions for the phrase.52 Like Gal 6:14, these oaths can evoke scenarios in which Paul employed them as reactive curses against accusations, particularly Rom 1:9. However, Phil 1:8 and 1 Thess 2:5 are difficult to explain based only on the idea of reaction. Even in Romans, Paul’s repeated assertions concerning the purity of his own conscious and motivation makes the oath banal if it is merely reactive. Thus, the proactive conditional intent of these oaths, is a function of the teleological solidarity which Paul perceived as a defining characteristic of the Christ-covenant and of faithful covenant participation.

Two common exegetical problems are that Paul called upon God to witness those things that could not be objectively verified by others (e.g. thoughts, feelings, attitudes, etc.) and that Paul’s use of oaths violated Jesus’ prohibition. Both issues are readily reconciled by considering the covenantal function of oaths. Note the following three examples of oaths in Paul’s inherited historic narrative which were used to define a covenant. First, Laban used an implied oath to create a covenant with Jacob: “If you ill-treat my daughters, or if you take wives in addition to my daughters, though no one else is with us, remember that God is witness between you and me” (Gen 31:50). Second, ancient law employed an oath to adjudicate a situation with a missing animal and make the judgment binding: “[If] it dies or is injured or is carried off, without anyone seeing it, an oath before the Lord shall decide between the two of them that the one has not laid hands on the property of the other; the owner shall accept the oath, and no restitution shall be made” (Ex 22:10b–11).

52 Another potential oath is 1 Cor 1:10a. If so, Paul would be placing his audience under an oath curse.
Third, a volitional unconditional oath bound the community in obedience to Jeremiah’s prophetic instructions: “Ἔστω κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν εἰς μάρτυρα δίκαιον καὶ πιστόν (LXX Jer 49:5).

These examples illustrate the possible prototypical necessity of an oath was to protect those under the associated covenant from future threats against their solidarity. The problem is that the declarative function of the oath (defining the curse) tends to overshadow the performative function (establishing the covenant) because embodied cognition places the highest probability of any instantiation of a threat to be an embodied person. Therefore, the conditions which would activate the curse are the aspects of an oath which are most amenable to human scale because they are most easily by sensorimotor perception.

These examples also permit the possibility that the prohibition of oaths pertains to the prototypical time compression inherent in a covenant. The reissuance of an oath as validation of a previous oath evokes the counterfactual scenario that the first oath was not undertaken in good faith. Therefore, the reissuance is proof that a violation has occurred and the curse has been activated. If the primary motivation for an oath is a self-proclamation of honesty, then again, banality is the best outcome.

Therefore, like Stowers’ reconsideration of μὴ γένοιτο, Paul’s θεὸς μάρτυς oaths should not be seen as reactive responses to criticism, but as proactive conditional curses which illustrate the level of complexity which developed as Paul integrated himself, his converts, and his detractors into the teleological solidarity of the Christ-covenant. It is the same thought process as the ἀνάθεμα blend in Rom9:3, with an additional specificity as to the conditions under which Paul would expect to incur divine judgement. Because die Heilssphäre der Gottes had manifested in the physical space occupied by the resurrected Jesus, Paul’s prototypical space for APOSTLE was not organised by the frame SELF-FULFILMENT, but by the frame SELF-SACRIFICE.

For this reason, the extreme emotion inherent in the oaths should not be mistaken for a lack of logic. The repetition of 1 Thess 2:5 in declarative form in 2:10 shows that the oath could be used to structure the argument and progress the thought. Yet, the inherent logic in Paul’s employment of θεὸς μάρτυς is always predicated upon his blended identity as an apostle of Christ, which, again, consistently exhibits an exquisitely balanced presentation of humility and power designed to focus the attention of the audience on the logical telic event which is emerging as the perceptible ontological structure of human existence. The emotion involved in Paul’s oaths reveals that the physical manifestation of the solidarity
of believers was the precise point at which he experienced the Christ-covenant at human scale. Therefore, as the Apostle of Christ to the Gentiles, Paul felt responsible to protect the interpersonal solidarity within any community or between any persons at any cost, even in his words, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν.

9.6) Conclusion

Paul’s curse language was consonant with the first-century Mediterranean worldview and functioned as apotropaic rituals based on the Christ-covenant. Paul’s use of curse language reveals that he believed disunity within the faith community to be the single most dangerous threat for understanding and participating in the Christ-covenant. The main problem for Paul was that even though, as a direct threat to the faith communities, disunity could be conceptualized and cursed as abstractions such as unbelief, ignorance, and inappropriate behavior, banning these abstractions through the ἀνάθεμα ritual meant banning responsible individuals. However, ἀνάθεμα ritual maintained a redemptive purpose by focusing the apotropaic intention on the attitude or behaviour as the identifiable threat which retains repentance as a continually active possibility.

For ἀνάθεμα, the state of persona non-grata is repealed if the contraindicated behaviour is eradicated. Thus, the apotropaic intention of the ἀνάθεμα ritual was the redemption of the body by the destruction of sin. Similarly, the unconditional reactive nature of μὴ γένοιτο exorcised attitudes and behaviours which threatened or prohibited Christ-covenant participation. This exorcism extended to misuses of the original covenant as misappropriations of the Christ-covenant. The issues which engendered the response μὴ γένοιτο were not peripheral concerns, but threatened the very structure of Paul’s gospel by conceptualising spirituality as a mechanism of cause and effect that was non-personal and non-binding.

Ostmeyer asserts that Paul’s prayer language consistently provides spaces in which people can communicate with God and Christ because, “Außerhalb des Kommunikationsraumes ist nichts als Heillosigkeit.” Here, remaining inside the communication spaces meant, for

---

53 Note again that a connection between 1 Cor 5:11–13 and Deut 17:7 LXX (ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν) does not necessitate Paul advocating physical death as the punishment for potential violators.

54 Cf., Barclay, The Gift, 547, “His own role as “apostle of the Gentiles” features prominently, but there is more at stake here than self-promotion or an apologetic claim that his Gentile mission is oriented for, and not against, the salvation of Israel. We seem to strike here on a logic that finds in the success of the Gentile mission an indication that the momentum of mercy will finally enfold also Israel itself.”

55 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 365.
Paul, always anticipating and preparing for the parousia because only eternal physical life could permanently prevent hopelessness. Paul’s curses were intended to set the boundaries and provide the protection for anyone who wished to practice faithfully preparing for the emergence of eternal physical life while under the constant threat of the ontic, though temporary, experience of death. This understanding can provide a balance to an apparent tendency for the discussion of Paul’s self-designation ἀπόστολος/ δοῦλος Χριστοῦ to separate him from his audiences as an instructor standing over and against his pupils. At times, the exegetical emphasis on the corrective elements in the letters seems to suggest a conceptual chasm between Paul and his audience comparable to the separation of believers from nonbelievers.
Chapter 10) Faithful Christ-Covenant Gebetspraxis as the Embodiment of Hope

This chapter examines Ostmeyer’s conclusion that, “Für Paulus ist nicht eine besondere Gebetsform das Spezifikum christlicher Existenz, sondern die durch Christi Tod und Auferweckung ermöglichte Beziehung des Gläubigen zu Gott, die sich in den verschiedensten Arten zu Beten äußern kann,” and Harder’s assertion that Paul did not advocate a proper Christian Gebetshaltung.¹ Although, this study supports both scholars, embodied cognition and Paul’s Gebetspraxis directives present two significant challenges. First, ECS precludes an absolute distinction between Gebetspraxis and Gebetshaltung; hence, Ostmeyer’s distinction between Gelingender and Misslingender Kommunikation must be sustained. Second, Paul did issue specific Gebetspraxis instructions and corrections, albeit very few. Barclay puts the question perfectly, “Is Paul’s theology, in its original context, as much about social as individual transformation, and does the gift of God in Christ ground the creation of communities capable of challenging taken-for-granted norms?”²

The following analysis shows that Paul’s positive and negative Gebetspraxis directives represent a teleological Gebetshaltung that phenomenally emerged from the Christ-narrative. However, neither his use of prayer nor his directives represent mechanistic mandates because that would violate the fundamental principle that the Christ-covenant wrought a cosmic solidarity. Therefore, interpreting them requires inferring two points of reference from his language—the point at which Paul experienced the practice of prayer as the human scale scenario which embodied faithful Christ-covenant participation; and the point at which he perceived an active or potential violation. Furthermore, the problems Paul addressed were complex phenomena which emerged from the cognitive dissonance between the Christ-narrative and normative human sensorimotor perception.

The first two sections examine Paul’s use of Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ (Gal 4:6, Rom 8:15) and the ἐξομολόγησις-kneeling image (Phil 2:10–11, Rom 14:11) as functions of Paul’s theologising which contributed to the emergence of an embodied Gebetshaltung of hope. While neither Paul’s use of the phrase Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ nor the ἐξομολόγησις-kneeling image are direct instructions, he employs both as key physical elements in significant

¹ Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 115. For Harder’s argument see section 2.2.
² Barclay, The Gift, 2.
pedagogical contexts. The question is, did Paul consider these physical elements necessary for faithful Christ-covenant Gebetspraxis?

The third section analyses the groaning of the spirit in Rom8:26–30 as the prototypical manifestation of the embodied Hope-Gebetshaltung which emerged from the Christ-narrative. The fourth section examines Ostmeyer’s proposal that Paul’s edicts for continual prayer were summary statements of faithful Christ-covenant participation by analysing their intense spatiotemporal compressions.

The final section engages the problematic instructions in 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 1 Cor 14. Even though these issues cannot be fully addressed within the limits of this thesis, it does not seem reasonable to omit them from the discussion. The analysis is not offered as definitive, but as an example of how ECS illustrates the potential difficulty involved for a particular community to integrate Paul’s proclamation of the new ontology.

10.1) The Phenomenal Emergence of Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ

In Gal 4:6 and Rom 8:15, Paul creates a blend in which the phrase Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ is the direct speech of a prototypical believer who bears the witness of the Spirit. The two primary problems presented by the phrase are the minimal and sporadic divine-father imagery in the OT versus its ubiquity in the NT, and the titular use of an Aramaic word to qualify the Greek synonym.3 The second problem led Stendahl to conclude that the phrase must have been a frequent part of the liturgy, but that it was not a natural part of Paul’s personal prayer language.4 However, this seems to be an anachronistic imposition of the distance between liturgical language and everyday speech as experienced by modern practitioners. Embodied cognition means that the cognitive impact of the blend would have been directly proportional to the frequency with which the phrase was used in the act of prayer. The effectiveness of the image would have been severely weakened if Paul was not known to use the phrase himself. Therefore, the term is better understood as a phenomenal emergence of apostolic preaching.5

3 Much of OT father language describes human relationships. Direct divine father references include: Deut 1:31, 32:6, 32:17–19; 1 Chr. 22:10, 28:6; Pss 2:7, 89:26; Pr 3:12; Jer 2:27, 3:4–5, 3:19, 31:9; and Mal 1:6, 2:10, 3:17. In the Pauline corpus, the divine-father image appears at least once in every letter.


5 Cf. Berger’s proposal concerning the collocation χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη discussed in chapter four.
As to the first issue, some scholars suggested the difference was due to an OT aversion for the physical fatherhood of God. For example, Claus Westermann wrote, “God is never designated as father before the post-exilic period, and even then it is only on the odd occasion. By this time the danger of the term’s being misunderstood, in the sense which it had in myth, had dropped into the background.”\(^6\) However, Svetlana Khobnya’s recent study shows that the image of God as Father of Israel was established in the Exodus, extended to the Israelite kingship, and developed by the prophets as a fundamentally defining motif of the relationship between God and Israel.\(^7\) Khobnya also shows that the fatherhood of God was routinely assigned to Israel’s eschatological redeemer throughout Second Temple Judaism and selectively extended to Gentiles based upon the righteousness and mercy of God.\(^8\) Sometimes eschatological salvation and Gentile inclusion were related so that Hippolytus conceived God’s final judgment as “administering the righteous judgment of the Father to all, assigns to each what is righteous according to his works” (\textit{Against Plato, on the Cause of the Universe}, 3).\(^9\) Other times, the universal fatherhood of God appeared apart from any specifically Jewish eschatology as in Philo’s designation of God as “the creator and father of all” (\textit{Opif.} 2.7).

In Westermann’s defence, Herodotus reported with suspicion the traditions that Zeus and Apollo slept with the oracular priestesses when present in their temples (\textit{Hist.} 1.181–184). However, the divine father image was still vibrant in Paul’s time. Epictetus refers to Zeus as the father of the gods and humanity (\textit{Diss.} 1.3, 13; 3.11, 22). Virgil describes Aeneas’ fleet running “safely on its course, Serene in Father Neptune’s promises” (\textit{Aen} 5:863). In fact, Abera Mengestu shows that divine-human kinship was essential to Graeco-Roman worldview and religion from Homer to the establishment of the Roman Empire.\(^10\) The emperor-as-father image maintained a consistent sense of municipal transcendence that

---


\(^7\) Svetlana Khobnya, \textit{The Father Who Redeems and the Son Who Obey: Consideration of Paul’s Teaching in Romans} (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013), 20–34.

\(^8\) Khobnya, \textit{Father Who Redeems}, 37, 42.


was employed to advance human self-understanding and moral orientation by establishing the emperor as the divine founder, saviour, and preserver of the people.\textsuperscript{11}

Although Mengestu is careful to show that Paul’s kinship language varies in purpose, sometimes calling for assimilation and accommodation, and sometimes relativizing the audience’s cultural kinship mores by redefinition, this study continues to question the conclusion that Paul arrives at a polemic “by gradually constructing the ‘us’ over against ‘them.’”\textsuperscript{12} The alternative proposal for Paul’s identity construct is given in section 9.2.2. The present consideration is whether Paul’s divine-father language, specifically Αββα ὁ πατήρ, represents either an intentional critique or strategic parallel of “Augustus’ meticulous planning toward acquiring the title \textit{pater patriae}.”\textsuperscript{13}

From the perspective of this study, Mengestu’s use of the term \textit{narrative} needs qualification. It is agreed that Paul’s use of divine father imagery consistently “creates and reinforces a narrative that portrays Christ-followers” as siblings of a single father.\textsuperscript{14} Yet, this is not the same thing as creating a ‘narrative world,’ so that Paul “is not engaging them only at the level of theological reflection but also at the level of their narrative thought, sometimes to affirm and sometimes to change their narrative thought.”\textsuperscript{15} First, it must be noted that the only way to engage people at the level of theological reflection is to engage their narrative. A theological conversion inherently includes accepting a new narrative paradigm.

Second, the ‘us-against-them’ paradigm pre-existed Paul in the prototypically different theological anthropologies of Judaism and the Roman imperial worldview. As Mengestu shows, the Graeco-Roman organising frame for divine father imagery equated God with the human capacity for reason and assessed leaders as the most rational of the populace.\textsuperscript{16} Therefore, the divinisation of the Emperor was a logical blend of divine father imagery and political power that achieved human scale by compressing divine-human interaction into an idealized geo-political scheme.

\textsuperscript{11} Mengestu, \textit{God as Father}, 59–61.
\textsuperscript{12} Mengestu, \textit{God as Father}, 162.
\textsuperscript{13} Mengestu, \textit{God as Father}, 164.
\textsuperscript{14} Mengestu, \textit{God as Father}, 163.
\textsuperscript{15} Mengestu, \textit{God as Father}, 161.
In Jewish theology, the prototypical divine-human relationship was a blend in which the kinship was the sole result of God’s creation of humanity in his image. This \textit{Imago Dei} blend maintains a paradoxical tension between the intrinsic divine-human kinship and the objective distance between humanity and the divine. Although the \textit{Imago Dei} was the animating force that identifies God as father, it was also viewed as a gift given to humanity which is otherwise unattainable. While it is possible to describe OT institutions such as the Law and the King as compressing divine-human interaction into an idealized geo-political scheme, the narrative which maintained God at an objective distance entailed the fact that these institutions were given by God, not manifested by divinised persons. In Jewish anthropological theology, no human could be divinised, unlike the Graeco-Roman concept, because no one had the capacity to become a divine instantiation. Any attempt to do so would be anathema.

Third, the Christ-narrative was equally disruptive of the Jewish narrative. No longer was the covenant restricted by ethnicity or geography. Geo-political institutions were deprived of any teleological significance in the divine-human relationship. Instead, the inheritance of the Christ-covenant was eternal life in the coming age which had dawned with the resurrection of Jesus. This narrative created the prototypical believer who lived as one who had been resurrected while anticipating the day of universal bodily resurrection. The inheritance of land was expanded to the entire creation which included life itself.

The argument here is that the ontological claims of the Christ-narrative are sufficient to account for the substantial use divine father image in the NT, and the titular Αββα πατήρ naturally emerged as a manifestation of the cosmic solidarity inherent in the Christ-covenant—οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίοις οὐδὲ Ἑλλην ... εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἀρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ᾽ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι (Gal 3:28–29). Thus, Paul’s strategic use of the Αββα ὁ πατήρ phrase cannot be a direct critique of the imperial \textit{pater patriae}, or any other concept of divine-father imagery, because of his fundamental claim that everything has been replaced with the singular, emerging life-structured ontology. Instead, he employs it to critique the behaviour of the audience by compressing the identity of the prototypical believer with the resurrected Jesus by the κληρονόμος and υἱοθεσία language, thereby intimating the Parousia as the teleological purpose of the prayer.\footnote{Αββα ὁ πατήρ may partially map suffering and the crucified Jesus as well since Mark used it in the Gethsemane prayer (14:36).} While the physicality of Paul’s claims could place him at odds with another ontic structure, his point of beginning

17 Αββα ὁ πατήρ may partially map suffering and the crucified Jesus as well since Mark used it in the Gethsemane prayer (14:36).
was “participate in Christ,” which relegates “do not participate in …” to a derivative contingency.

Because Paul’s main critique is against behaviour within the ἐκκλησίαις, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ does not connote the inner witness of the Spirit as an abstract comfort for individual believers who must endure the present oppression.18 Paul presents the prayer as the evidentiary guarantee for the believer’s continued participation in the Christ-covenant. In other words, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ is a mnemonic narrative that represents both the process and the product of Christ-covenant participation. The transliterated Ἀββᾶ does not qualify the Greek ὁ πατήρ. Both terms denote an ontological relationship derived from the concept ‘Father,’ and Ἀββᾶ does not suggest an increased intimacy.19 Instead, the two terms together form a linguistic manifestation of the singular Kommunikationsraum des Gottes. Notice that the πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας in Rom8:15 is the same as τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ in Gal 4:6 as well as the witnessing πνεῦμα in Rom8:16. Unfortunately, the translation “Father, Father,” does not communicate the intention. The suggestion here is to use the double transliteration, “Abba Pater!” instead of the traditional “Abba! Father!”

This does not suggest that uttering the phrase was necessary for covenant participation. Neither Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ, nor any other lexeme is necessary to the ontology of the covenant. Yet, because not all words can convey the Christ-narrative, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ emerged as the best way to communicate the cosmic solidarity claimed by the narrative.

10.2) The ἐξομολόγησις-Kneeling Image: Joyful Praise or Subjugated Concession?

In Philippians 2:10–11 and Romans 14:11 Paul employed the ἐξομολόγησις-kneeling image as a telic embodiment of the emerging Christ-covenant.20 It is probable that the collocation of kneeling and confessing was an entrenched network for Paul since both texts are dependent upon LXX Is 45:23, and because kneeling in supplication constituted an ECIN in the ancient world.21 The question here is what emotive scale is mapped by the image. Bockmuehl makes the following assertion concerning Phil 2 because Isaiah allows

---

18 See 10.3 below.

19 For one, the ontological status of father, child, slave, sibling, or inheritor is not dependent upon a certain level of intimacy.

20 Whether Paul composed the Philippians text is inconsequential. His use of the language is sufficient for the analysis.

21 F. S. Naiden, Ancient Supplication (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). However, he does not use the terminology.
for the confession to be made by both willing subjects and those who are subjugated by
divine force:

It is in keeping with the eschatology both of Deutero-Isaiah and of the NT that the
coming of God’s final rule is considered to be not just a pious wish but an
unstoppable certainty. In the same way, too, this universal worship is inevitable:
many will ‘bow the knee’ to him in joyful adoration, though some who were his
enemies may find themselves doing so in shame.22

Obviously, this study affirms that Paul’s Christ-covenant eschatology was characterized
by an unstoppable certainty; however, it is proposed that, in both Philippians and Romans,
the εξομολόγησις—kneeling is dependent on the generic space HUMILITY as Paul’s
prototypical emotive organizing frame for embodying Christ-covenant solidarity, which
does not map a negative experience because he intended to encourage behavior that only
promotes faithful covenant participation. Unless the image can contribute to the
emergence of a more specific negative organizing frame, such as the begrudging
concession of a conquered people, then punctiliar questions about less-than-faithful
participation are overly specific, and detract from the communicative purpose of the
blend.23

In Philippians, the image culminates a summary use of the Christ-narrative to explicate the
embodied cognition and behaviour of Jesus. The implied motion in Phil 2:10–11 is an
access path for manifesting the injunction in 2:5 to embody Christ-covenant solidarity
through interpersonal humility that will result in exaltation on a scale commensurate with
the exaltation of Christ. Because this access path compresses embodied interpersonal
solidarity with the resurrection of Christ as the teleological order of growth in the Christ-
covenant, the εξομολόγησις—kneeling image focused the attention of the audience on the
parousia as desirable experience by presenting a mental schema of unmitigated and
unending joy. Notice that Paul goes on to emphasise forgetting the negativity of the past,
πλὴν εἰς δ ἐφθάσαμεν, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν (Phil 3:13–16), and exhorts the audience to focus
solely on positive thoughts and emotions (4:8). Most significantly, he directly states the
reason for his emphasis on the positive: σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, δς
metaσχηματισε τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ
κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα (3:20b–21).

22 Markus Bockmuehl, The Epistle to the Philippians, BNTC 11 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 146.
Similarly, O’Brien Philippians, 241.

23 See 8.2) The Emergence of Solidarity in Paul’s Conditional Blessings
In Rom 14:11, the humility emotive frame provides an advent path to the telic event by compressing any attribute that could be even tangentially recognized as an opposition to the negative attributes of judgment and disdain into the singular ἐξομολόγησις-kneeling image. As such, the image serves as the mental sculpture of the prototypical Christ-covenant participant. Again, Paul does not map begrudging confession into the image because his own personal experience of the telic trajectory in the Christ-covenant as joyfully volitional solidarity.

Regardless of cultural or religious constraints on Paul’s language, or any reasonable inferences by his audiences, the complex dynamic motion of humility allows for a reasonable picture of Paul’s intention to be singularly focused on the miraculous accessibility of actualizing the emerging life-structured ontology amid a death-structured ontic environment. Due to embodied cognition, the ἐξομολόγησις-kneeling image provided a very effective sensorimotor example of eagerly anticipating the inevitable emergence of the eternal state of dynamic solidarity. Therefore, the ἐξομολόγησις-kneeling image is not presented as a necessary, or forced, physical act of obeisance, but as a positive exemplary prototype of embodying the Christ-covenant (i.e. living in the blend).

10.3) The Groaning of the Spirit as the Epitome of an Embodied Hope-Gebetshaltung

While it is widely acknowledged that the ἄσθένεια depicted by τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἴδαμεν refers to the object of prayer and not the manner, style, or occasion, no discussion has been found concerning the relationship between this lack of knowledge and the Parousia. Dunn’s assessment four decades ago appears to remain standard: “we see the two sides of charismatic consciousness, for Paul at any rate—the consciousness of human impotence and the consciousness of divine power in and through that weakness.” Here the problem is a lack of control for the prototypical frame of knowing. Again, Ostmeyer is on point: “Betende verstehen, auch wenn sie konkret um etwas bitten, ihr Gebet in der Regel nicht als Akt zur Behebung eines Informationsdefizits auf Seiten Gottes.”

---

24 The debate concerning an overt Christological reference is overly binary. The fact that interpersonal discord is antithetical to the worship of God is predicated upon God’s status as living. In the OT, Yahweh is distinguished from idols on precisely the delineation between living and non-living. Yet, Paul’s understanding of Jesus as the incarnation of the promises of God would preclude excluding a reference to the resurrected Christ. Here, Paul blends the narratives so that the identity of κύριος is consonant with the LXX, but the referent of ζῶ ἐγώ remains multivalent and necessarily underdetermined. The emergent meaning of the blend is the inherent connection between prayer and covenant narrative.


As reflected by Andrzej Gieniusz’ dissertation, any analysis of Rom 8:26–27 must begin with Rom 8:18. On the one hand, he convincingly argues that the relationship between παθήματα and δόξαν should be understood as, “Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory,” because verse 18 is not a matter of simple comparison in which future glory is declared superior to present sufferings. Instead, παθήματα and δόξαν are contrasted in the strongest terms possible to reject the very thought that present sufferings represent any possible threat to the certainty associated with the future glory. However, due to methodological commitments, Gieniusz reads this propositio as Paul’s redefinition of hope in light of suffering, wherein hope and suffering are paradoxically reciprocal. “[S]uffering has what is hoped for as its cause and it itself in a sense is a condition sine qua non of our awaiting.”

If this is correct, then Rom 8:18–30 says that the deferment of the glory creates suffering in the believer by intensifying the awareness of the present ἀσθένεια. There are two major weaknesses with this proposal. First, if ἐλπίς causes παθήματα, then ἀσθένεια is also a necessary condition for ἀπεκδέχομαι, and the aid of the spirit is unnecessary. Second, eagerly awaiting the relief of something that is necessary to maintain hope for future salvation creates a cognitive dissonance that can only be overcome if ἐλπίς and τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς are abstractions and do not indicate an objective future event. Therefore, the logical end to Gieniusz’ proposition that Paul makes hope and suffering paradoxically reciprocal by redefining hope in light of suffering is a denial of the historicity of the Christ-narrative.

Gieniusz’ error is his conclusion that Ὡσαύτως in 8:26 cannot refer to the preceding verse because 8:23–25 do not support this understanding of hope. Ironically, his premise that 8:23–25 do not support his argument is correct. Noticeably absent from his analysis is 8:23b—τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν—which signifies that the Christ-narrative redefines suffering in terms of the hope. Because the Parousia is the teleology of the ἐλπίς in 8:24–25, this ἐλπίς remains unseen precisely because it has yet to fully emerge into the field of sensorimotor perception, not because it is an abstract concept which is


28 Gieniusz, Suffering, 209.

29 This verse is noticeably absent in Gieniusz’ analysis.
inherently imperceptible to human vision. In fact, ἐλπίς is the antithesis of hope as an abstract concept.

Therefore, Ὡσαύτως in 8:26 denotes that, in the same manner that the object of hope is unseen, the necessary objective for prayer is unknown. In other words, the missing knowledge refers to the exact nature of τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. The logical connection of Ὡσαύτως is that this knowledge is necessarily inaccessible for the same reason that ἐλπίς is necessarily unseen—the resurrection has not yet been experienced. Therefore, ἀσθένεια describes the pre-Parousia perspective of the prototypical believer who lacks the ability to see or conceptualize the future glory. This weakness is not an ontological inability to pray, related in some sense to “creatureliness.” It is simply the experiential and epistemic limitations of the pre-Parousia embodiment. However, with logic that parallels 8:18, Paul assures his audience that this human ἀσθένεια regarding the teleology of the covenant cannot thwart present participation in it. The ever-present Spirit of God effectively facilitates all human participation in the salvific covenant.

Hopefully, at this point it will be obvious why the communication of the Spirit is described as ἀλάλητος. Language cannot be employed to describe what cannot be experienced. However, communication cannot be conceptualized without employing LANGUAGE as a prototypical category. The result is στεναγμός ἀλάλητος. The function of στεναγμός is to assure the audience that the communication of the Spirit coincides with their desire for salvation and vice versa. The groaning of creation does not illustrate “axiomatic solidarity between creation and man” as much as it is the logical extension of the salvation of humanity. Physical resurrection cannot occur without a physical environment. Here, the best summary for Rom 8:26–27 is put forth by Käsemann:

Paul allows Christian worship especially to be the manifestation of a deep, even if highly-charged, solidarity between church and world … Otherwise worship would be filled with a faith which would no longer be hope … which inevitably turns the church into a conventicle instead of the beginning of a new world.

---

31 Arguments for glossolalia lack control of the COMMUNICATION prototype.
32 Concerns about the Holy Spirit groaning are senseless.
33 Gieniusz, Suffering, 175.
Christian ἐλπίς is the beginning of a new world because it is the proclamation of exactly that. Thus, Christian worship is the beginning of a new world inasmuch as it is the embodiment of Christian ἐλπίς, which means that maintaining the specific frame of the Christ-narrative has further implications vv 28–30. First, the adversativity of δὲ in verse 28 is strong, but the positive knowledge is not conciliatory because the pre-Parousia ἀσθένεια is not a liability to covenant participation. Rather, the positive knowledge is offered as supporting covenantal evidence for confidence in the help of the spirit. Second, 8:28 cannot be read in isolation as an axiom or a proverb. The momentum of this blend begins with the pre-Parousia ἀσθένεια and steadily builds until it climaxes with the final image of a glorified prototypical believer. This does not preclude the application of 8:28 to any number of specific situations. The point is that any situation which may turn out for the good of the believer must be understood as pointing to the eventual resurrection of the believer. If the inherent weakness of the believer is the pre-Parousia embodiment, then the aid provided by the Spirit in prayer is assistance in remaining focused on the redemption of the body as the totality of πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν.

This means the significance of 8:29–30 is the dramatic presentation of the Christ-covenant Heilsgeschichte. God as the active agent reinforces the certainty of the covenant. The concepts of foreknowledge and predestination evoke the idea of a primordial covenant. The progression of the primordial covenant with verbs καλέω, δικαιώω, and δοξάζω are a compression of the Christ-covenant from public ministry to crucifixion to resurrection. Therefore, 8:29b—προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς—should be read as a reference to the future resurrection of believers.

Again, if the Christ-narrative is the specific organizing frame for the whole of 8:18–30, then suffering is redefined specifically in terms of the hope depicted by the resurrection of Jesus. Much preferred is Julius Schniewind’s summation, “Das Gebet wird in Röm. 8, 26f. so beschreiben, wie es sich aus der dikaiosune theou gestaltet.” Thus, the new world that is represented by Christian worship is the one in which life is eternal and death is non-existent. The solidarity between the church and the present world is based on the idea that the church represents what the world is to become at the Parousia.

35 Julius Schniewind, Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1952), 91.
10.4) Continual Prayer as *christliche Grundhaltung*

Ostmeyer says, “Die Mehrzahl der Gebetsäußerungen in der paulinischen Korrespondenz ist der Kategorie „immer währendes Gebet“ oder „Gebet als Grundhaltung des Christen“ zuzuordnen.”36 Furthermore, since, “Der einzelne Gebetsakt ist das Explizitwerden der implizit immer vorhanden Gebetsbeziehung … Wenn Paulus zu permanentem Gebet auffordert, so fordert er zum Gebet als christlicher Grundhaltung auf.”37 This section analyses three versions of the injunction to pray “without ceasing” (Rom 12:9–21, Phil 4:2–9, and 1 Thess 5:12–22) and the various functions of the phrase νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας. It shows that the blended space of continuous praying maximises the emotive scale of desire for covenant participation by minimally mapping the specificity of the act of prayer. The unique identity that emerges is, as Ostmeyer states, a prototypical faithful practitioner as incarnated prayer.

The three correlated cognitive difficulties with Paul’s imperative instructions are the intense time compression, the level of specificity elicited in the respective mental schemas, and, as designated here, the *list-effect*. Yet, this type of time compression is commonly employed when the frequency of self-involvement is such that the mental schema of the person prototypically involves the activity (e.g. She is always running. He never stops talking.) These blends do not map the linear sensorimotor experience of continuous time, but create advent paths that give the impression of global access and direct insight into an essential characteristic of a subject for a specific purpose. Consider Paul’s claims that he placed himself in danger every hour (1 Cor 15:30–31) and always being handed over to death (2 Cor 14:11). By compressing the diffuse array of perilous experiences into an ever-present state, the blend gives the audience the sufficient number of events and participants to create the human scale scenario necessary for them to evaluate his claims. While these statements are hyperbolic in the strictest sense, the scale of hyperbole experience by the audience is proportional to the ease with which they could replace their mental recreation of Paul and his scenario with themselves and their mental schemas of PERILOUS DANGER.

In the same way, the amount of hyperbole experienced by an audience as they encounter instructions for continual prayer is mostly determined by the mental image of a human

---

scale scenario which gives the most holistic impression. For example, in isolation, the phrase ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε (1 Thess 5:17) typically evokes a mental schema for prayer which is too specifically detailed in terms of embodiment and mental focus to be easily included in the intense time compression of the term always.\textsuperscript{38} Yet, the schemas evoked by Rom 12:12 and Phil 4:6 are generally less distressing because τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες and ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωριζέσθω πρὸς τὸν θεόν are proportionately more vague in terms of embodiment and more punctiliar in reference to time.\textsuperscript{39}

Further evidence that embodied vagueness and punctiliar time are more cognitively amenable than embodied specificity and temporal vagueness is the fact that the images which bracket ἀδιαλείπτως are Πάντοτε χαίρετε and ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε. The impression of semantic difference is the greater degree of embodied specificity invested in προσεύχομαι as compared to either χαίρω or εὐχαριστέω (though the later probably elicits more specificity than the former).

The different degree of embodied specificity elicited by concise phrases in close proximity creates what is designated here as the list-effect. Essentially, reading a number of successive brief phrases which evoke an equal imperative emotive naturally elicits the prototypical LIST organizing frame which achieves human scale in the sensorimotor experience of hearing or reading an itemised list. The cognitive effect is that greater intentional processing effort is placed on the items as individuated than on their common context. Furthermore, the impact of the list-effect is also proportional to the number of perceived individual. However, because human cognition is naturally, and most often unintentionally, a top-down process, another aspect of the list-effect is the hermeneutic conclusion that Paul is piling description upon description in order to achieve a rhetorical emphatic impact.

While this is true, it is only derivatively so. The primary question is what elicited such an intense emotive scale that motivated the compound utterance chains? In each of the passages which contain exhortations to continual prayer, the common framing narrative is the preservation and promulgation of the solidarity which is readily accessible to those ἐν

\textsuperscript{38} This is reasonable explanation for why O’Brien says that Paul’s use of ἀδιαλείπτως in 1 Thess 1:2 refers to his regular times of prayer, but does not express the experience of continual remembrance.

\textsuperscript{39} The use of προσκαρτερέω in Num 13:20 could be a source of interesting cross-mapping with the idea of continual prayer as a verification of widow status in 1 Tim 5:5.
κυρίῳ. Therefore, Paul’s instruction chains of unceasing Gebetspraxis are intense emotive advent and access paths which reveal his desire for his audiences to have a continual sense of global insight and direct access to their Christ-covenant participation, and his belief that covenant participation is always readily accessible. The conceptual irony is that the specificity of the person of Jesus of Nazareth and the sensorimotor experience of the self-perception of each individual as an integrated unit simultaneously create a conceptual stative vagueness for ἐν κυρίῳ that requires constant and repetitive active participatory description in order to develop the level of complexity necessary for the survival of both the community as a whole and the individual units.

This is also evidenced in the only undisputed epistolary instance of the phrase νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας in reference to prayer. In and of itself, the phrase is sufficient to create the sense of global insight and direct access into the concept of eternity and the totality of human existence because the sensorimotor experience of time is naturally grounded in these two categories. Yet, in 1 Thess 3:10, Paul’s emotive scale elicits the additional adverb ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ. It seems that Paul is not linguistically equipped to express the scale of his desire.

As in other areas in this study, there is evidence for the connection between regular, and even continual, prayer as a function of both interpersonal and divine-human covenants. For example, the alliance letter Johnathan sent to both the Romans and the Spartans purportedly claimed: ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἀδιαλείπτως ἐν τε ταῖς ἑορταῖς καὶ ταῖς ἑορταῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέραις μιμνήσκομεθα ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἑσάχθηκας τῶν ἱερών ἁγίων ὑμῶν, ὡς δέον ἐστὶν καὶ πρέπον μνημονεύειν ἀδελφῶν. εὐφραινόμεθα δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ δόξῃ ὑμῶν (1 Macc 12:11–12).

However, the day-night collocation may have been more typically expressive of the divine-human covenant concept within the 2TP. 1QS 10:10 reads, “At the onset of day and night I shall enter the covenant of God, and when evening and morning depart I shall repeat his precepts.” Joshua 1:8 and Psalm 1:2 use the phrase for meditating on the Law, and 4Q418 i:4 uses it for meditating on “the mystery of existence.” In the LXX prayer of Solomon, it describes the constancy of the community’s prayers and God’s attentiveness

---

40 In 2 Tim 1:3, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας and ἀδιαλείπτως are used in conjunction to denote prayer as evidence of deep affection.

41 Frags. 43, 44, and 45.
to those prayers (3 Kgdms 8:28–29). Solomon’s benediction reiterates the phrase to emphasise that devotion to the commands of the Lord was a singular act of inter-Israel covenant maintenance and the proclamation of the covenant to the nations (3 Kgdms 8:59–60).

Most interesting is Isaiah’s use of the phrase to describe the Lord’s eschatological protection (27:3) and wrath (34:10), and its ontological function in the restoration oracles in Jeremiah 33: If any of you could break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night would not come at their appointed time, only then could my covenant with my servant David be broken (20b–21a); Thus says the Lord: Only if I had not established my covenant with day and night and the ordinances of heaven and earth, would I reject the offspring of Jacob (25–26a).42

In reference to covenant solidarity, Paul employs the image of working night and day in Thessalonica so that the proclamation of the gospel will not cause any burden to the community.43 Because Paul framed working day and night in context of his mission, there is a partial cross-mapping between the physical toil which averted the burdensomeness of the mission and the Gebetspraxis he employed in the execution of the mission. The teleological function of the phrase is revealed by the cross mapping of life with day and sin-death with night in 1 Thess 5:1–11 and Rom 13:11–14. In both instances, Paul employs the image to focus the attention of the audience on the nearness, but unpredictable, appearance of the day of the Lord. Thus, the relationship between τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας (Rom 13:14b) and παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἕνα (1 Thess 5:11) equates to the prototypical image which Paul assigned to himself and his audience in 1 Cor 10:32–33 discussed below. The conclusion here is that Ostmeyer’s assertion holds because the physical cosmic solidarity wrought by the resurrection of Jesus compressed the concept and act of prayer into a singular space which was continually inhabited by any Christ-covenant participant as a natural emergence of the complexity of participating in a life-structured ontology, entrenchment notwithstanding.

42 These oracles are not found in the LXX.

43 The same theme is repeated in 2 Thess 3:8.
10.5) Prayer and The Emergent Complexity of the Christianity in Corinth

Much of the commentary on the troubles Paul addressed in Corinth concentrate on the continued influence of Graeco-Roman socio-cultural religious concepts and practices. The point here is that, in a generic worldview conceptually structured by religion as the physical space for experiencing any purported transcendent reality, it would be difficult for anyone, either Jew or Gentile, to adjudicate their behaviour within the parameters of Paul’s claims. Add to this the fact that the only religious sensorimotor frame of reference available to any convert was the complex adaptive religious system that had fundamentally shaped their worldview since birth, and the tendency towards confusion, if not chaos, is readily understandable. However, none of the problems Paul addressed were predictable. As in chapter nine, the corrections were not necessarily evoked by anger or frustration, but by the logical implications of the cosmic solidarity and emergent motion which Paul understood to be explicitly revealed in the Christ-narrative.

A) The Gender-Based Gebetshaltung Problem in 1 Cor 11:2–16

The presumption here is that the mental image schema of 1 Cor 10:32–33 governs the entire paraenesis in 1 Cor 11. At present, the two critical points of this image are the nominal phrase ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε and the positive emotive scale of ἀρέσκω μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφορον, both of which are badly marred by the NRSVA translation. Rather than, “Give no offense,” the phrase has the far more powerful force of a cognomen: the last, most personal, and most common name that signified Roman citizenship. The problem, of course, is that a construal such as “Be the Inoffensives in the presence of the Jews, the Greeks, and in the assemblies of God,” does not quite work in English. It is, however, equal to the phrase, “Χριστιανοί γίνεσθε.”

The other phrase is not similarly burdened. Rather than, “just as I try to please everyone in everything I do …,” it can easily read, “Be just like I am in all things. I am pleased by not seeking my own advantage, but seeking the advantage of others—their salvation.” Understanding the organising frame of solidarity in this way does not solve all the interpretive problems in 11:2–16. Yet, it does potentially reprioritise certain questions and

44 Cf. Barclay, *The Gift*, 336–337, “Gentile believers who had abandoned their traditional religious practices were certainly vulnerable to social pressure, and one may imagine the Galatian believers struggling to create, regulate, and defend a communal lifestyle that took its bearings from the Christ-event but had no precedent or social analogue. Their reception of Paul’s message had disrupted their previous habitus, with its traditional customs and dispositions, but they had yet to develop a robust alternative. In this liminal and uncertain state, it was attractive to place their new convictions about Jesus, and their new experience of the Spirit, within the established matrix of the Jewish tradition.”
allow for ones which may have been previously unconsidered, mainly by keeping the
hermeneutic focus on the Christ-narrative as the full measure of Paul’s focus.

If all of chapter 11 is governed by the same prototypical ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε identity
assumed by Paul, then the stark contrast between 11:2 and 11:17 is of primary
significance. The latter specifically identifies an active and frequent violation of
communal solidarity which, from Paul’s perspective, should never have occurred because
of his previous instructions. The former mitigates the necessary active frequency and
nature of the gender-based Gebetshaltung in question because its occurrence could be
attributed to a lack of previous instruction or an honest, though still deadly, failure on the
part of the audience to integrate the distinct and thorough worldview change of Christ-
covenant participation. The hermeneutic difficulties for Paul, and his later interpreters, is
significantly more difficult in the Gebetspraxis paraenesis because correcting an
unanticipated or mistaken action is far more difficult to explain. In fact, the very nature of
embodied cognition naturally obscures how the process of Paul’s theologising is in the
foreground of the passage rather than the act.

For example, the only cognitive association necessitated by the κεφαλή relations in 11:3 is
a relational ontological bond between the constituents, so that any shame brought upon an
individual κεφαλή is also associated with the integrated complex unit of divine-human
solidarity embodied in Christ. Note that this is generically achieved without any notion of
hierarchy, because that concept is a more specific framing narrative which has various
manifestations Parent-child, king-subject, employer-employee are examples of inherent
hierarchic relations that have fundamentally different prototypical spaces which have an
inestimable number of nuances and can be cross-mapped to create an inestimable number
of blends.

Moreover, the fact that the act in question has something to do with the physical
presentation of a person’s head is not the primary reason that the blending involved in
Paul’s Gebetspraxis theologising requires the consistent translation of κεφαλή as head to
maintain the conceptual integrity of the passage.45 In Paul’s conceptual blend, the κεφαλή
relations compress the identity of the practitioner with the personhood of both Χριστός and

45 Even though the term source is rejected as an adequate translation, Thiselton’s observation stands: “The
valid point in all of the arguments for “source” is not that κεφαλή necessarily means source but that (pace
Grudem) it does not seem to denote a relation of “subordination” or “authority over,” Corinthians, 815–816
(italics original).
so that praying and prophesying are not a matter of contacting a divine agent, but a process of representing the divine presence. The cognitive space Paul creates is one in which the proper Christian Gebetshaltung is inherent to a person qua person ἐν κυρίῳ. No special performance or prop is necessary. On the contrary, any attempt to improve upon the person qua person ἐν κυρίῳ results in shame, denoting a self-destructive practice in the restructured human ontology of eternal physical life. Therefore, unless Paul is contradicting his own fundamental principle, verse 11 cannot be a special circumstance of equality which he used to rationalise an otherwise acceptance of female subordination. Rather, analogous to the argument in 1 Cor 7:17–24, it is an affirmation that the identity wrought by participating ἐν κυρίῳ is one of equal standing regardless of gender because of the equal proximity of the divine presence. Therefore, whatever verse 10 signifies, it is reasonable to assume that Paul’s intention was to protect the gender solidarity which is necessary to his ἐν κυρίῳ construct.

A more specific description may be offered by explaining how the Corinthian practice was antithetical to faithful Christ-covenant participation within the generic spaces OBLIGATION, SELF-CONTROL, and SHAME. In this regard, two studies to note are by Philip Payne and Bruce Winter. Based on ancient archaeological and textual evidence, they both argue against an interpretation of female subordination. Like Thiselton, they point out that Paul’s argument concerns the Gebetspraxis of both genders respective to a κεφαλή physicality. They also agree that hair length and style did have specific Graeco-Roman cultural connotations pertaining to an individual’s sexual attitude and availability. For men, long hair was effeminate and suggested homosexual activities. For women, long hair worn loosely suggested promiscuity and prostitution, and short hair or a shaved head was a typical punishment for adultery.

Yet, they differ on the exact nature of the problem. Payne situates it within female participation in Dionysiac rituals which featured charismatic shaking unbound hair. Thus, he argues that ἄκατακαλύπτως and κατακαλύπτομαι refer to women’s hair respectively as hanging loose and properly bound, and that verse 10 is a directive for women to exercise responsible control over their physical heads, because the over realised eschatology of Paul’s Corinthian audience had become susceptible to syncretism in this area.


47 See Thiselton, Corinthians, 800.
Conversely, Winter argues that ἀκατακάλυπτος and κατακαλύπτομαι refer to the veil worn in public which signified the marital status of a woman, and that verse 10 refers to married women intentionally removing the veil when praying or prophesying in a worship gathering. Yet, the edict does not subordinate wives, but protects the public integrity of the community from the confluence of two factors. First, he says that the regular meetings of the Pauline community were regarded with suspicion because, apart from civic worship, Graeco-Roman worship was primarily an individual activity. Second, Winter illustrates a general social revolution among Roman women at the time in which they were discarding the gender-based double standard in sexual ethics. It is quite reasonable to imagine a scenario in which a woman would consider removing her veil in the process of public prayer or prophesy to be a positive assertion of gender equality which she also inferred from the Christ-covenant. The problem would be that the act could also be inferred by others as either a rebellious act against tradition or an inappropriate act of licentiousness. Thus, Winter proposes that the phrase διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους refers to messengers as spies intent on discrediting the community.

Despite, and possibly due to, their differences, both studies are equally helpful in two proposals offered here. First, due to the nature of embodied cognition, the difference between Graeco-Roman religion and Paul’s gospel was not always obvious to practitioners who had moved from the former to the latter, particularly due to the marked disparity of sensorimotor experience between Christian and Graeco-Roman worship. Second, Paul’s point of departure for this Gebetspraxis instruction was the primordial Judaic SIN-NAKEDNESS organising frame in which nakedness becomes sinful inasmuch as it signifies seeking one’s own advantage by disadvantaging another. Not only was the prototypical sinlessness of nakedness in the context of marriage retained by emerging Christianity, the absolute openness which Paul associated with ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε amounts to the primordial unashamed nakedness. From the perspective of this thesis, Dan Lé’s recent study on the nakedness of Jesus on the cross as a necessary part of the atonement model is not only well argued, but seems inescapably correct.48 Payne’s reconstruction would constitute a self-aggrandising act that explicitly utilised sexuality to gain an advantage over others, while Winter’s would render an implicit variation. Either way, the obligation for the woman or wife to retain a sign of authority upon her head signifies her responsibility to honour the redemption of the physical body wrought by the

---

crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus by not using her sexuality as an offensive weapon. Correlatively, Paul’s κεφαλή instructions regarding male Gebetspraxis would be equivalent.

However, this passage is also a prime example of the quagmire created by the underdetermination of language. Although the assertion that the import of the Judaic creation myth is theological gender equity and not biological gender bias remains unmitigated, Paul’s explication in 11:7–9 and his argument from φύσις in 11:15 is compressed in such a way that determining his exact personal position is less certain. His explication in 7–9 is undeniably linear and the obligation of a woman to veil/bound her hair is somehow contingent on the timeline of the creation myth. Had Paul stopped here, the issue of the veil would be strongest as would the possibility that he held some rationalised complementarian view of gender. Yet the argument from φύσις seems to elicit the vague image of female hair long enough to cover her nakedness, which buttresses Payne’s argument.

The fact that Paul was male and was biologically organised to appreciate female beauty is also undeniable. Much more work would be necessary to analyse the potential compressions here. However, though the Aphrodite cult of Roman Corinth was significantly diminished from its Greek predecessor, and the scale of temple prostitution has probably been consistently exaggerated, Winter cannot accurately assert that the Roman Aphrodite “had become Venus … and was no longer a sex symbol.”49 In a work attributed to Lucian of Samosata, the head, hair and facial features of the nude Cnidian Aphrodite were blended with the heavily cloaked Sosandra Aphrodite, and the via-media dressed Aphrodite of the Gardens to describe the sculpture which would reflect the most beautiful woman the author had ever seen, with the caveat that her head would not be veiled.50 The point is that Paul and the Corinthians were wrestling with the same problem—how to manifest the complete redemption of the human person, which includes human sexuality, in a manner that, yet again, is neither self-undermining nor denying the obvious. At least in this Gebetspraxis issue, the divide between Paul and the potential offenders had a methodological origin. Paul was integrating the reality of human sexuality within the physical worship space into the Christ-narrative to determine proper covenant

49 Winter, After Paul Left Corinth, 88.

participation. Any violations were the result of trying to integrate the Christ-narrative into an existing sensorimotor frame. Therefore, analogous to the reorientation of his curses, the force of verse 16 was to empower the audience for synchronic self-organisation with the Christ-covenant, and not to establish Paul as an external controlling force. Were that the case, they could not ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε just like him.

B) The Emergent Complexity of Christian Gebetsfunktion in 1 Cor 14
Like the curses and the gender-based Gebetshaltung, Paul’s primary concern in 1 Cor 14 is preserving the solidarity of the community as their sensorimotor experience of faithful covenant participation and as the sensorimotor manifestation of the Christ-covenant ontology for those who yet remain außerhalb des Kommunikationsraumes mit Gott und Christus. Thus, what appears to be an adjudication between prophecy and glossolalia is, instead, Paul’s attempt to explicate the further implications of the conceptual blend in 1 Cor 12:27 — Ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους, which is, itself, a teleological explication of the Incarnation. In the same way that Jesus is fully God and fully human, Christ-covenant participation is fully corporate and fully individual. The extension, which constitutes the ύπερβολὴν ὄδὸν is that just as Jesus had to appear to his followers as a fully integrated living person after his death, the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ must appear as a fully integrated living organism in order to represent the resurrected Jesus to those who have never heard of such and thing— ἰδιώται—and to those who still find the concept unbelievable—ἀπιστοί (14:23). Paul knew that without manifesting solidarity, there was little chance that the uninformed could understand or the sceptic could be convinced to move from ἔρει τὸ Ἀμήν (14:16).

Within the contingent context, the emergent meaning of 1 Cor 14 is that limiting the revelatory Gebetsfunktion to either the individual member or the ἐκκλησία would push the Corinthian community beyond the limit of tolerable internal variation, and the community would dissolve because it would have lost the essential structural element of cosmic integration. In other words, to the Graeco-Roman, the Corinthian prayer would appear no different from their own—the human attempt to contact the divine. For any Jew of the period, internal Gebetsfunktion confusion would be proof that the Jesus-as-Christ-narrative was the ἀνάθεμα which Paul once tried to destroy. Thus, the emergent complexity of prayer in the Christian religious adaptive system was its function to embody the ontological divine-human solidarity wrought by the resurrection of Jesus for the πιστός, ἀπιστός, and ἰδιώτης alike. This requires a prototypical prayer blend in which these three designations are not mechanically divided into “friends, enemies, and idiots,” but are
instead first integrated into a single category of “those loved by the God who created them in his image to have everlasting life.” Then the fractures are defined by the two teleological categories “those who have seen the emerging salvation of humanity from death” and “those who have yet to see.” Even though, the second group is further delineated along the teleological scales of human volition and cognition, the Christ-narrative makes the first group responsible for motivating everyone else to move from whatever position on those scales into the οἶδα-Heilssphäre der Gottes by embodying the cosmic salvation incarnated in Christ Jesus.

10.6) Conclusion

This chapter shows that the difficulty with interpreting Paul’s instructions on prayer has nothing to do with defining or delimiting paraenesis.\textsuperscript{51} Rather, his instructions represent the complexity which developed as he integrated himself and his audiences into the Christ-narrative as embodied participants in the Christ-covenant. The main thrust of his instructions on prayer is to maintain the integrity of Christ-covenant participation by insisting that the practice of prayer is always a physical manifestation of the cosmic solidarity wrought by the resurrection of Jesus, and a physical anticipation of the telic event which will bring that solidarity into full sensorimotor perception—the Parousia and the bodily resurrection of believers into eternal physical life. Therefore, the instructions are framed by prototypical connections between embodied covenant participation and the emerging sensorimotor experience of an environment suited to sustaining eternal physical life. Even more important to the analysis of Paul’s instructions is the sustained proposal that the claims of the Christ-narrative were, at best, difficult to assimilate into an ontic experience which remained antagonistic to those claims by the most basic function of human cognition—sensorimotor data. As Ostmeyer observed: “Durch ihn haben die Christen schon jetzt, obwohl der alte Äon noch fortbesteht, Anteil am Äon des Heils.”\textsuperscript{52} Therefore, the level of significance invested in the physical salvation of humanity and the human environment purported by the Christ-covenant proportionally increased the

---


\textsuperscript{52} Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 116.
urgency of a correct Gebetspraxis and decreased the need for an established Gebetshaltung because the latter is a natural emergence of maintaining the former within the frame of the Christ-narrative.
This thesis intended to investigate three questions: 1) To what extent did prayer define and distinguish Paul’s mission; 2) To what extent was Paul’s own act of prayer necessary to the execution of the mission, and why; and 3) To what extent did the prayers of his audiences constitute their participation in that mission, and why? The goal was to offer a plausible picture of how Paul’s prayer language fit into his world as an embodied function of his Gentile mission without undermining his theological claims or denying any exegetical difficulties. The first section of this conclusion reviews the challenges of analysing Paul's prayer language and the hermeneutic approach of this study taken in response. The second section answers the research questions by reviewing the main conclusions from the study. The third section discusses the contributions to scholarship and potential further research offered by this thesis. The concluding section proposes the extent to which Paul’s prayer language can be considered normative for modern Christian prayer.

11.1) Analysing Paul’s Prayer Language: Challenges and Embodied Cognitive Science

Initially, the two challenges to this study were identified as Paul’s various, and potentially contradictory, uses of prayer, and the common understanding of prayer as an ‘internal,’ subjective experience which cannot be measured in terms of function and efficacy. The literature review explored different approaches to these challenges, and discussed the points at which they were beset by theories of cognition and language that were either mechanically or philosophically reductionistic. The exception was Karl Heinrich-Ostmeyer’s 2006 study which made the methodological assertion that modern literary theory justified defining NT prayer language as the linguistic realisation of prayer as the physical act of turning to God. This methodological move released Ostmeyer from the strictures of form criticism and the history of religions school, and still provided his analysis with a robust critical structure that investigated how an authors’ understanding of prayer emerges from a text, or group of texts. The most interesting characteristic of Ostmeyer’s study was the way he described the function of Paul’s prayer language in terms of space and time. His major conclusions were that the singular purpose of Paul’s Gentile mission was to integrate humanity in to “seine Gebetsbeziehung zu Gott,” and

1 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 78.
that the locative terms ἐν θεῷ/Χριστῷ/κυρίῳ/πνεύματι signify Paul’s Oberbegriff for the Gebetsbeziehung zu Gott because Paul’s prayer language was a process in which, “Die Grenzen zwischen religiösem und profanem Bereich verwischen, das „Weltliche“ wird hineingenommen in die durch Gott und Christus bestimmte Sphäre.”

To show the significance of Ostmeyer’s study, this thesis employed aspects of the relatively new scientific discipline of Embodied Cognition which provides empiric evidence that spatiotemporal patterns are foundational to neural function, and that there is a reciprocally causal relationship between neural function and how an individual assesses and responds to sensorimotor perception. As Léon Turner says, “One of the great virtues of theories of embodied cognition … and perhaps their chief virtue [for] theological anthropology … is their determination to understand human being in a broad array of its mental, physical, and sociocultural contexts simultaneously.”

Achieving such a complex understanding required developing a hermeneutic of embodied cognition involving four theoretic parameters: 1) cognitive and linguistic theories which construe thought and language as emotive, evaluative, and action-oriented, rather than neutral and truth-conditional; 2) complex dynamic systems theory; 3) a distinction between the ontological and ontic realms of human existence and experience; and 4) Conceptual Blending Theory as a heuristic model that allows for direct sensorimotor perception and imaginative extrapolation. The advantage of an embodied hermeneutic is that it afforded the opportunity to analyze Paul’s concept of prayer and the use of prayer language as the confluence of biology, the environment, and human volition.

11.2) Prayer and Participation in the Gospel: Theses and Conclusions

The thesis defended in the study was that Paul’s prayer language was necessarily grounded in his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus which constituted a

_____________________________

2 Ostmeyer, Kommunikation, 47.


restored ontology of human existence in which death no longer existed. All that remained was eternal physical life in the physical world in which Paul was living and in which Jesus had been resurrected. However, Paul was not delusional. He understood that the ontic human experience remained structured by sin and death. Yet, he was convinced that the life-structured ontology wrought by the resurrection of Jesus presented new ontic possibilities which could be actualised amidst an ontic human condition constrained by death, primarily because the life-structured ontology entailed an ontological solidarity that was immune to ontic human action. For Paul, the ontology of the Christ-covenant was not a mystically mediated adjustment to the human experience, but a genuine and complete replacement which was emerging even as he went about the execution of his mission.

Even so, actualising the new ontic possibilities of the life-structured ontology remained constrained by human volition. His insistence that this restored ontology was presently active and readily accessible created formidable cognitive and communicative dissonance for his audiences because the ontic realm of human experience remained structured by sin and death. To overcome that dissonance, Paul’s prayer language provided the sensorimotor perception necessary for his audiences to understand what he was trying to tell them. As it emerged, Paul’s prayer language redefined space and time in a way that allowed his audiences to embrace the epistemic accessibility and experiential power of the Christ-covenant. Therefore, his mission, and the formative aspect of his prayers in that mission, was the embodied manifestation of his own participation in the life-structured ontology as he guided others to do the same, despite their sensorimotor experience in which death remained a constant threat.

The most formidable challenge became describing how such a task was possible? This study showed that, even though Paul’s prayer language was not unique in the first-century Mediterranean worldview, his sensorimotor experience of the resurrected Jesus entailed a cosmic divine-human solidarity which made it distinct from both 2T Jewish prayer and Graeco-Roman cultural religious expression. As Barclay says, Paul’s story “is not a common Second Temple narrative with a Christological conclusion: it has a newly discovered plot-line, shaped by the incongruity of grace.”

---

5 Barclay, The Gift, 568.
The conclusions can be summarised in three points: 1) Paul’s prayer language exhibits a conceptual coherence in content and function that is best described in spatiotemporal terms; 2) This coherence depends upon a partial, but radical, redefinition of spatiotemporal categories; 3) The cognitive processes involved in Paul’s use of prayer and redefinition of space and time are common to humanity, but the specific content and function of his prayer language is distinctive to his mission as an Apostle of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles.

A) How Paul’s Prayer Language Defined and Distinguished His Mission

Concerning Pauline hermeneutics, James Dunn writes:

The danger… is that we forget how dynamic was the transmission of the tradition, the theologising, the retelling of the story. Simply because we encounter these performances… of Paul’s theology, in frozen literary form, we should not assume that there was a fixed something that could be uncovered simply by stripping away later or contingent features…. To abstract a fixed story from within the variable rhetoric of various retellings would be to misunderstand the character of Paul’s theology.6

This study does not abstract a fixed story that can be systematised as if Paul could not have expressed himself in any other way than what is in the literary artefacts. Rather, this thesis showed that, due to the nature of human cognition, the impetus for Paul’s mission had to be a sensorimotor narrative with a level of descriptive coherence that gave him the impression of global insight and direct access to an integrated holistic worldview. Thus, Paul’s theologising emerged as he explained how a spatiotemporal event had restructured the ontological human condition without necessarily restructuring the immediate ontic human experience. In that process, Paul imaginatively employed the Christ-narrative in his prayer language to focus the attention of his audiences on the Christ-covenant as an asymmetric cosmic category metamorphosis which integrated human existence into an eternal complex adaptive system of physical life.7


7 It is inconceivable that this could be achieved unless he consistently told a story constituted by a prototypical sameness that tolerated and constrained the variations necessary to make it applicable in any given situation.
Therefore, despite overwhelming agreement with Barclay’s study, the point of beginning for Paul’s concept of Christ as God’s gift to humanity is not his theology of sin, but his sensorimotor perception of the resurrected Jesus. In that event Paul perceived that the physical presence of God was necessary to resolve the singular existential problem of sin-and-death. On the one hand, Barclay rightly says that, “Grace is discovered in an event” and that the life, death, and resurrection constitute the single event which is the focus of grace in Paul’s gospel. Moreover, he writes:

And the resurrection of Jesus is that explosive moment when the power of the Spirit was unleashed, creating the life from death on which the believers’ faith is pinned (4:24–25) and out of which their identity is formed (6:1–12; 8:9–11). This trio — power, Spirit, resurrection — constitutes the mode by which the Christ-gift takes transformative effect in the human sphere…. highlighting the resurrection and the power of the Spirit … identifies what will constitute the hallmark of gift and mercy in Romans: its capacity to create ex nihilo as the incongruous power of God.

It is also agreed that, “If human history is traced in patterns of cause-and-effect, the divine continuity of promise is apt to work despite, or against, the continuity of the human story: in this sense, ‘salvation-history’ cannot be read out of normal accounts of ‘history.’” However, the problem arises in this conclusion:

Right up to the moment of resurrection a believer remains simul mortuus et vivens. What is given to them is not a new set of competencies added to their previous capacities, nor an enhancement of their previous selves: what is given is a death and the emergence from that death of a new self, essentially “eccentric” in its dependence on the resurrection life of Christ.

The incongruity of Christ as the gift of God is not primarily that it cannot be returned in kind, or that it disregards all preconceived constructs of worth. While these statements are true (and Barclay’s main emphasis is on the latter), they are derivatives of the incongruity that Christ is the gift that makes believers vivens inter mortuus. Indeed, the resurrection of the believer does not grant a new set of competencies, nor simply add enhancements to the human person. Furthermore, “eccentric” is the best adjective for the Christian faith

---

because the resurrection of the believer is not the Christian hope, but a derivative of the parousia of the risen Christ. Not all believers will experience the parousia via their own resurrection.  

The direct analysis of Paul’s prayer language concluded that each usage-based category created cognitive blends for living in the Christ-covenant by disproportionately blending his inherited Jewish tradition and Graeco-Roman sociocultural religious expression into his sensorimotor experience of the resurrected Jesus. In sum, Paul’s prayer reports, blessings, curses, and instructions on prayer are conceptual blends that provided opportunities for his audiences to participate in the Christ-covenant and exemplars to ensure the integrity of their participation. The passion and urgency in his prayer language was a manifestation of his concern that the interpersonal solidarity of the emerging life-structured ontology was much more ontically available and powerful than his audiences understood.

His prayer reports created the impression of direct access to his physical presence and the presence of the resurrected Christ, which anticipated the telic human scale scenario involving the mutual physical presence of Jesus and all those who believe. His blessings were organised by the frame GIFT-GIVING-BY-PROXY which created a joint attentional triangle between Paul and the audience focused on the resurrected Jesus as the telic embodiment of God’s cosmic salvation. His optative prayers were not less-than-certain wishes for his audiences, but blessings invested with a high scale of certainty in his sensorimotor perception of the risen Jesus and an intense emotive desire for the sensorimotor implications of that event to be actualised in the ontic realm of human experience. The result was a blend for living in the Christ-covenant which approximated an unlimited scale for experiencing the ‘already’ which was intended to increase the desire for the ontology that had ‘not yet’ fully emerged. The element of ‘wish’ is best understood as Paul’s desire for his audiences to take full advantage of the new potentials and possibilities afforded them by the Christ-covenant. His doxologies were participatory responses to the human entailment in the Christ-covenant which expressed a teleological

13 Also, simul mortuus et vivens is precariously close to simul iustus et peccator, the forensic concept which Barclay aptly disputes.

14 Cf., Barclay, The Gift, 569, “The goal of Paul’s mission is the formation of communities whose distinct patterns of life bear witness to an event that has broken with normal criteria of worth.”
reciprocity that emerged from a joy borne of incredulous wonder. His curses set the boundaries and protection for anyone who wished to prepare for the emergence of eternal physical life while under the constant threat of the ontic, though temporary, experience of death. Finally, Paul’s prayer instructions insisted that the practice of prayer was a physical manifestation of the present cosmic solidarity created by the Christ-covenant, and a physical anticipation of the telic event which will bring that solidarity into full sensorimotor perception—the Parousia and the bodily resurrection of believers into eternal physical life.

B) Why Paul’s Prayer Language was Necessary to His Mission
In Paul’s prayer language, the Christ-narrative (the story) and the Christ-covenant (the experience of the story) are self-organised and self-regulated by the prototypical concept of “ontological presence anticipating ontic presence amidst ontic absence.” Paul’s prayer language was necessary to the execution of his mission for two reasons: 1) *Prayer facilitated the mission as a function of living in the life-structured ontology by eliciting mental schemas of the crucifixion and resurrection as the singular physical telic manifestation of the Christian life, and the parousia as the emerging physical telic manifestation of the new ontology*; 2) Because the Christ-narrative was the cognitive frame for Paul’s prayer language, *it allowed others to gain their own impression of global insight and direct access to the Christ-covenant.*

C) Prayer and Audience Covenant-Participation
Although the prototypical connections between Paul’s prayer language and the Christ-narrative revealed that his apostolic authority was grounded in the epistemic and experiential accessibility of that ontology, Paul’s prayers revealed that there was no difference, in kind or degree, between his apostolic commissioning and the covenant participation of every individual and community. Because the motion in Paul’s prayer blends actualised the presence of θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ within the collective presence of Paul and his audiences, the act of prayer on behalf of his audiences also had two implications for their covenant-participation: 1) *Prayer reoriented the audience away from any controversy to the absolute solidarity among Christ-covenant participants*; 2) *Prayer heightened their eager, but patient, anticipation of the physical presence of the resurrected Jesus accompanied by the resurrection of believers into an eternally life-structured ontology.*
11.3) Contributions to Scholarship and New Avenues of Enquiry

This study affirms Ostmeyer’s assertion that Paul intentionally used prayer to integrate everyone into his prayer-relationship to God because interpersonal solidarity was consistently presented as the primary new ontic potential for a present sensorimotor release from sin-and-death. Furthermore, Paul’s Oberbegriff for prayer emerges from the locative terms ἐν θεῷ/ Χριστῷ/ κυρίῳ/ πνεύματι because they summarily compress variations of the fixed space occupied by the physically resurrected Jesus which emerged in Paul’s prayer language as the dynamic interface of actualising and anticipating the emerging life-structured ontology which he believed would eventually become the normative human ontic experience.

This thesis advances Ostmeyer’s conclusions by showing that embodiment is always the point of beginning for interpreting human behaviour and language. Literary theory is only helpful if it is understood to be an extension of the embodied linguistic attributes of the human person. Paul's prayer language is rightly understood as a function of time and space because it always emerged as an embodied instantiation of his mission as the interface of his interaction with others and the environment. Yet, by definition, embodied science cannot produce unassailable conclusions because of the claim that consciousness is grounded in, and partly defined by, sensorimotor perception.

Potentially, this same definition implies that embodied cognition is an inexhaustible field of enquiry for Pauline studies.¹⁵ Some textual examples are: How does an embodied hermeneutic coordinate γρηγορέω and νήφω (1 Thess 5:6), and the phrase ημεῖς δὲ ημέρας ὑπόστερ νήφωμεν (1 Thess 5:8), or the relationship between ὧν λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου (Rom 8:9) and the spatial location for the solidarity of believers in Rom 8:15–16? Three broader questions that could be explored are: 1) The extent to which Paul inferred the limits of embodiment in 1 Cor 2:9; 2) Since the difficulty with prayer is describing the relationship between the act and faith, how might an embodied hermeneutic adjudicate between the present epistemological assurance in 1 Cor 3:21–23 and the need for the emergence of the telic scene to resolve the epistemic gap between teleological and mechanical orders of growth;¹⁶ and 3) If Paul’s prayer language is universally integrative, ¹⁵ Based on Ostmeyer’s assertion that all the NT authors exhibit the same understanding for prayer, it would be particularly helpful to apply an embodied hermeneutic across the corpus. ¹⁶ i.e. Then we will know fully even as now we are fully known.
how might the appellation “Apostle to the Gentiles” and the phrase “Gentile mission” be re-examined?17

11.4) Pauline Prayer Language: “Normative, Not Timeless”

The spatiotemporal nature of Paul’s prayer language means there is a degree to which it was, and remains, normative for Christian prayer, in both content and function. As Barclay writes:

Because the Christological event of grace is both highly particular and impacts on any criteria of worth that are not derived from the good news itself, Paul’s theology does not remain encased within its first-century context. One does not have to find “timeless principles” by extracting general truths from particular historical debates: Paul himself saw the general relevance of a theology of grace that reconfigured the map of reality.18

In this reconfigured map of reality, the term symbolic should be excised from Pauline hermeneutics because the idea of a symbolic world, or thought world, ultimately disembodies Paul’s language and makes it impotent. Paul’s language cannot be read with a Platonic lens because the significance of Paul’s prayer language in his mission to the Gentiles was its contribution to the complexity necessary for emergent Christianity to survive, which was predicated on the physical events described in the Christ-narrative. One need not believe Paul’s message to admit that he did not distinguish between his sensorimotor perception and an abstract symbolic representation.

Each event in the Christ-narrative is an emergent embodiment that signifies the resolution of the primordial Jewish tragedy — separation from YHWH, culminating in physical death. Paul’s prayer language was necessarily oriented to the parousia of Christ because it is the universal sensorimotor experience of God’s cosmic resolution. It is not necessary to know the details, as in what effect such a physical existence may have on the laws of physics. It is only necessary to understand that the cognitive coherence of the Christian narrative is grounded in the teleological order of growth that matures into eternal physical life. Otherwise, the complexity necessary for Christianity to exist as a complex religious adaptive system fails.

17 Appreciation is given to Dr. Khobnya for this intriguing observation.

18 Barclay, The Gift, 573.
In the essay “Petitionary Prayer: A Problem Without an Answer,” C. S. Lewis presents Christian prayer as a Gordian knot tied by the dominical sayings “Thy will be done,” and “Your faith has healed you.” His essay does not offer a solution, only the sobering fact that, for him, no one can answer the riddle, and yet petitionary prayer remains necessary and comforting. The answer to Lewis’ problem is to imitate Paul’s use of prayer in a way that maintains the ‘already-and-still-coming’ principle within the statistical fluctuations of our lives. As Barclay concludes, “By a strange paradox, Paul may be most significant today when he is most carefully re-situated in his own original context.”

Abraham Pais said that Einstein was a great physicist because, “Better than anyone before or after him, he knew how to invent invariant principles and make use of statistical fluctuations.” The conclusion of this thesis is that Paul was a great theologian because, possibly better than anyone, he made use of the statistical fluctuations in life to maintain the invariant principle that Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead, left the realm of human sensorimotor perception, and yet, will physically return again to ‘quicken both the living and the dead.’ Until that time, the normative Christian response, which summarises Paul’s understanding of the efficacy and function of prayer, is and will remain, Ἀμήν, ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

---
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